

# THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CXXXVIII.]

JUNE, 1856.

[Vol. XII.]

## KINGSLEY'S SERMONS FOR THE TIMES.\*

WE are sorry to see the descendants of "Phaeton" still flourishing. The "loose thoughts for loose thinkers,"—bad enough any where in proportion as they answer to their character,—are peculiarly bad in connection with Religion. Men are prone enough already to think loosely and vaguely of Christian truth and Christian obligation; and it is lamentable indeed to see them encouraged in their folly by the grotesque association of human devices with revealed truths, of affected quaintnesses with practical good sense, which is offered in these Sermons to the public through the press, after having been first presented to the author's own congregation. Mr. Kingsley is well known to be an *earnest* writer: he claims again and again by implication in this volume to be a careful, an anxiously exact writer: but the habit of "loose thought" seems to cling to him and entangle him so that he cannot shake it off, and thus inflicts on him continually the merited punishment for ever having idly or presumptuously indulged it, by pervading his views of those topics on which we are bound to believe that he desires to be most cautious and accurate.

What can be more strange and almost ludicrous, for instance, than his recommendation of the Church Catechism as the grand panacea for the evils resulting from the neglect of the reciprocal duties of fathers and children? Well might he anticipate that some of his hearers would "say to themselves with a smile, 'The Church Catechism!—that is but a paltry medicine for so great a disease—a pitiful ending, forsooth, to such a severe sermon as this, to recommend just the Church Catechism!'" Yet the strangeness and the ridiculous assumption of this recommendation are surpassed by what immediately follows: "Let those laugh who win, my friends. If you think you can bring up your children to be blessings to you—if you think you can live so as to be blessings to your children, without the Church Catechism, you can but try. I think that you will fail" (p. 13). What more could have been said of the Bible itself? No wonder

\* Sermons for the Times. By Charles Kingsley, Rector of Eversley. Pp. 360. London—Parker. 1855.

that, in the same ecclesiastical spirit, he speaks presently afterward (p. 34) of "taking liberties with the Bible *and the Prayer Book*,"\* just as though the two ought properly to be placed in the same category. Nay, so possessed does he seem to be with an almost superstitious reliance on the Church Catechism, that even in his Sermon (III.) on a Good Conscience, he makes it the prominent theme. Rarely have we beheld among Protestants a more lamentable exhibition of subjection to that yoke which every Established Church necessarily imposes, than in the almost profane rant about this Church Catechism, which Mr. Kingsley knows full well that multitudes of pious Christians conscientiously reject, and yet of which he scruples not to write and preach as though it were the one thing needful for Christian life and progress. Thus he prays that children may "keep the tender and child-like heart," and professes "good hope that God will grant" the prayer, and teach them "truly to know Him whose name is Love and Righteousness, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, as long as [he sees] His providence preserving for us this old Church Catechism."—"Yes (he continues in the same swelling style of bombast)—Yes, I can have hope for England, and hope for those mighty nations across the seas, whose earthly mother God has ordained that she should be, as long as the Catechism is taught to her children" (pp. 41, 42). Would not a stranger to our religion suppose that the Church Catechism had some divine prescription and authority at least equal to that of the Bible itself?

Nor less ridiculous is the attempt which Mr. Kingsley subsequently makes to analyze the process of religious instruction as carried on by this manual. The Sermon in which this notable analysis is presented is the IXth, on "the Lord's Prayer;" in which (as in Sermon III., on "a Good Conscience"), the Church Catechism is again made the first and prominent theme. Regarding this Church Catechism, he invites us to remark that it warns us that we cannot do our duty without God's special grace—no, not at all—nor any part of it; and then he proceeds as follows:

"But I want you to remark one thing more which is very noteworthy: that in this case, for the first time throughout the Catechism, the teacher tells the child something. All along the teacher has, as I have often shewn you, been making the child tell him what is right, calling out in the child's heart thoughts and knowledge which were there already. Now he in his turn tells the child something which he takes for granted is not in the child's heart, or which, if it is, has been put into it by his teachers, and of which he must be continually reminded lest he should forget it; namely, that he cannot do these of himself; that, as St. Paul says, 'in him,' that is, in his flesh, 'dwells no good thing;' that he is not able to think or to do anything as of himself, but

---

\* The italics are our own.



his sufficiency is of God, who works in him to will and to do of His good pleasure, who has also given him His Holy Spirit."—Pp. 130, 131.

Now what mere trifling with words is all this! What a sad specimen of the "loose thoughts for loose thinkers"! Does Mr. Kingsley really mean to aver that there is any essential distinction between what the teacher has been calling out in the child's heart by the previous questions, and that which he here calls on him to "know" or consider? Surely nothing can be plainer than that what the catechist here says is but by way of suitable reverential introduction to his next "question" or demand: "Let me hear, therefore, if thou canst say the Lord's Prayer:" which Prayer is accordingly given as the "Answer." It grieves us to see such foolish affectation as this—this call upon us to observe something as "very noteworthy," which turns out on examination to be nothing notable at all. In order to prove it *really* "noteworthy," it would have been necessary for Mr. Kingsley to shew that all the previous answers had been really elicited spontaneously from the child *without any precise and formal instruction in them having been previously given him*. But the very contrary is the fact. *Every* answer is as much supplied by the "catechist" as is this particular admonition—in every one equally he "*tells* the child" what it is desirable for him to know. Let Mr. Kingsley look again into his Prayer Book, and he will find the Catechism thus defined by the very authorities by whom it was prepared: "A Catechism, that is to say, an Instruction to be learned of every person, before he be brought to be confirmed by the Bishop." There is no pretence of "calling out in the child's heart thoughts and knowledge which were there already," in any one part of the Catechism more than in any other. The child has to *learn* throughout what is set before him; and his catechist, therefore, by putting the Catechism into his hands, "*tells* him something which he takes for granted is not in the child's heart," &c., just as much in one part as in another.

It is with unfeigned sorrow that we thus call on our readers to remark, as what is *in reality* "very noteworthy," the injurious influence which his subjection to human authority exerts on the mind of a truly original and earnest thinker, and we doubt not a truly pious man, in connection with the most momentous themes; how it makes him trifling and grotesque where he evidently desires to be serious and impressive. Nor is even this all. Under the same malignant influence, he becomes unfaithful in some instances to his own most solemnly avowed principles. Thus in p. 18 we read, "Nay, more, if we are to be very exact (and can we be too exact?) with the Lord's words," &c.—an expression evidently implying that he thinks the greatest exactness in interpreting "the Lord's words" an important duty. We cannot impute to our author the folly of limiting this duty

to the very words (ipsissima verba) of Jesus Christ. It is evidently of equal obligation in connection with the whole of the sacred Scriptures. Exact interpretation is to be aimed at throughout. Now, on this principle, what can we think of an interpreter of Scripture who can deliberately affirm and write as follows:

“Now, we may see this, above all, [that in old times it was the custom to give each child a separate name, which had a meaning in it] in the adorable Name of Jesus. That name, above all others, ought to shew us what a name means; for it is the name of the Son of Man, the one perfect and sinless man, the pattern of all men; and therefore it must be a perfect name and a pattern for all names; and it was given to the Lord, not by man, but by God; not after He was born, but before He was conceived in the womb of the blessed Virgin. And therefore, it must shew and mean not merely some outward accident about Him, something which He seemed to be, or looked like, in men’s eyes: no, the Name of Jesus must mean what the Lord was in the sight of His Father in Heaven; what He was in the eternal purpose of God the Father; what He was really and absolutely in Himself; it must mean and declare the very substance of His being. And so, indeed, it does; for the adorable Name of Jesus means nothing else but God the Saviour—God who saves. This is His Name, and was, and ever will be. This Name He fulfilled on earth, and proved it to be His character, His exact description, His very Name, in short, which made Him different from all other beings in heaven or earth, create or uncreate; and therefore, He bears His Name to all eternity, for a mark of what He has been, and is, and will be for ever—God the Saviour; and this is the perfect name, the pattern of all other names of men.”—Pp. 51, 52.

Can Mr. Kingsley be in earnest, or in his senses? we asked ourselves when we read this passage. Is he not trying how far he may venture to trifle with the credulity of his parishioners and readers,—or have not his “loose thoughts,” without his consciousness, become raving? If he profess to make this statement in sober earnest, we challenge him to produce his authority for it. We are sure that he can produce none which a Hebrew scholar (as he ought to be) would not instantly reject. He ought to know very well that the true interpretation of the name *Jesus* is that involved in the reason assigned by the angel of the Lord to Joseph for giving it: “Thou shalt call his name *Jesus*, for *he shall save* his people from their sins” (Matt. i. 21). The italics which we have used give the *exact* interpretation of this name. The word “God” is not to be found in it at all. Mr. Kingsley ought to know that the name *Jesus* was a name by no means uncommon among the Jews. He will find it in Acts vii. 45, Hebrews iv. 8, as the Greek form of *Joshua*; he will find it also in Colossians iv. 11, as the name of a Jewish companion of St. Paul. Moreover, even if the word “God” *did* enter into the composition of the name *Jesus*, which it does not, will Mr. Kingsley venture to allege that any inference can be drawn from such



a circumstance as to the nature or character of the person bearing that name? Then what will he make of *Jehoshaphat* or of *Daniel*, whose names he himself explains in the very same page (and correctly too) as each involving the very name of Deity? Will he affirm of either of these ancient worthies that he "was really and absolutely" God,—that the name "must mean and declare the very substance of his being"? Mr. Kingsley would be ashamed to make such an affirmation. He dare not do it.

Yet this is a specimen of the manner in which this popular writer attempts throughout his volume to maintain the established creed. He avows its various dogmas, he argues in defence of them, just as a man might do who was entirely ignorant that they had ever been called in question. We commend his defence of the *equality* of Christ with his Father (pp. 116 seq.) to the notice of our readers, in illustration and proof of this statement. We commend it especially to their notice in connection with the plain declarations of Jesus which are the very text of this strange comment.

We have dwelt the longer on these sad and mischievous blemishes, because we wish by our exposure of them to shew the real evil of *spiritual bondage* and of *loose thinking*, whether separate or combined; and at the same time the necessity for perseverance on the part of all the friends of religious freedom and of what we deem Christian truth. So long as sermons like these of Kingsley's are preached to Christian congregations and published for a Christian community, so long will it continue to be the duty of all who see their errors to protest against them plainly and earnestly; nor less earnestly against the national institutions and vain philosophies in union with which they are chiefly found. And the protest is the more urgently demanded because of the many excellences which are marred by these incongruities; among which we must particularly notice Mr. Kingsley's remarkable power of individual application of religious truth or precept,—a power which we doubt not his congregation must deeply feel. For these excellences, however, we must refer our readers to the volume itself, contenting ourselves with a single extract in conclusion, by way of specimen of much of the same quality which they will find scattered up and down throughout its pages.

Our extract is from a sermon entitled "Toleration." The last time we heard the word publicly used, it was by a venerable Bishop, who frankly apologized for it the moment it had escaped his lips; but our modern leaders of popular opinion are prone not unfrequently to lead it *backwards*. We would suggest "Christian Unity" or "Christian Charity" as the appropriate title.

"These are God's promises—simple and clear enough; and what are God's demands? Are they numerous, intricate, burdensome, a yoke which neither we nor our fathers have been able to bear? God forbid again! 'He hath shewed thee, oh man, what is good. And what doth

the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" And lest thou shouldest mistake in the least the meaning of these words, He hath shewed thee all this, and more, by a living example, fairer than all the sons of men, and through lips full of grace, in the blessed life and blessed death of His Son Jesus Christ, the brightness of His glory, and the express image of His person. To this, at least, we have already attained. Let us walk by this rule, let us all mind this same thing; and if in anything else we are differently minded, God in His own good time will reveal even that to us.

"Is not this enough, my friends? Then why should we bite and tear each other about that which is over and above this? If any man believes this and acts upon it, let us hail him as a brother. After all, let our differences be what they will, have we not one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in us all? If this is not bond enough between man and man, what bond would we have? Oh, my friends, when we consider this our little life, how full of ignorance it is and darkness; within us, rebellion, inconstancy, confusion, daily sins and shortcomings; and without us, disappointment, fear of loneliness, loss of friends, loss of all which makes life worth having,—who are we that we should deny proudly one single tie which binds us to any other human being? Who are we that we should refuse one hand stretched out to grasp our own? Who are we that we should say, 'Stand back, for I am holier than thou'? Who are we that we should judge another? To his own master let him stand or fall. 'Yea, and he shall stand,' says the Apostle; 'for God is able to make him stand.'

"Think of those last words, my friends, they are strong and startling; but we must not shrink from them. They tell us that God may be as near those whom we heap with hard names, as He is near to us; that He may intend that they should triumph, not over us, but with us over evil. And if God be with them, who dare be against them? Shall we be more dainty than God? And therefore I have never been able to hear without a shudder words which I have heard, and from really Christian men too: 'I can wish well to a pious man of a different denomination from mine; I can honour and admire the fruits of God's Spirit in him; but I cannot co-operate with him.' When I hear such language from really good men, I confess I am puzzled. I have no doubt that their reasons seem to them very sound; but what they are I cannot conceive. I cannot conceive why I should not hold out the right hand of fellowship and brotherhood to every man who fears God and works righteousness, of whatsoever denomination he may be."—Pp. 327—330.

This is a noble spirit surely. Here we have the generous earnestness of the real living man, free from the trammels of ordinance and creed. His theme inspires him by its congeniality. May it inspire us also ever to "maintain the truth in love"!



## THOUGHTS ON SECULAR ATHEISM.\*

## CHAPTER VII.

PROVIDENCE OVER HUMAN ACTIONS AND CHARACTERS; WITH A GLANCE AT  
THE QUESTION OF PHILOSOPHICAL NECESSITY.

OUR illustrations of the general laws of Providence have been thus far principally derived from the inanimate or from the irrational creation. If we advance to the rational and moral world of our own nature, capacities and obligations, we shall find this part of the Almighty's works equally subject to His providence and guided by appropriate laws. They are laws, indeed, of a very different kind from those which guide the material universe, and sufficiently distinguishable from those of instinct in the brute creation, but not less determinate nor less appropriate to the mental and moral phenomena which constitute their special province.

As there are different orders of being in creation, there are different orders of Law appropriately ordained for their respective guidance. As one order of being rises above another, Providence is found acting in reference to it by additional or more complicated methods,—not superseding, but modifying, the lower agencies by those that are higher. With the mechanical and chemical laws of inorganic matter, there are combined, when we come to the vegetable creation, certain forms of organization infinitely varied in its various orders and tribes, and a totally new and wonderful principle of *Life*, vegetable life, going through a most curious and marvellous process of growth, maturation and decay. This vegetable life, by virtue of its own higher laws, modifies, and to a certain extent controls, the merely mechanical and chemical laws of matter. The sap of a tree rises, in opposition to the known law of gravitation and beyond the range of capillary attraction, by the superadded power of vital action, a power deeply mysterious, not yet at all understood, but plainly manifested. The vital chemistry of the plant, in like manner, modifies all the chemistry of our inorganic laboratories. The higher laws of life modify the lower laws of mechanical and chemical action.

Then, rising to the animal kingdom, we find still higher powers manifested,—those of consciousness, susceptibility to pleasure and pain, and certain powers of voluntary action. This new principle of volition or *Will* is of a higher order and of more subtle and wonderful kind; but it is not a lawless power. We may confess we know nothing of its intrinsic nature (but what, indeed, do we know of the essential nature of any of the powers even of the material world?); yet we can trace its operations and assign some of the laws or modes by which it acts. We can

---

\* Continued from p. 212.

see how pure animal volition is directed to the choice of that which tends to the gratification or well-being of the animal, and to the avoidance of that which seems unpleasant or hurtful. We can see how it connects the percipient parts of creation with each other and with the unconscious portions. In many of those actions of the lower animals which have the clearest adaptation to the wisest ends, we may indeed doubt how far the power of will or choice is really exercised by the creatures. Their most marvellous impulses and decisions we rather call instincts;—decisions wiser than choice, impulses more unerring than creature reasonings, which point directly to the Supreme Intelligence as their instigation. But the creature, within a more limited range, has its voluntary choice of its own actions; and this will is a higher kind of law, but not a lawless power. It acts in reference to the impressions of sense and to the consciousness of pleasure and pain in the creature, and within the limitations prescribed by external agencies. It is the faint representation of that voluntary power in man, which (still under the limitations of conditions foreign to itself, in other beings and the great laws of the universe) acts not merely in reference to the senses and to sensible pleasures and pains, but also to the perceptions of the intellect and the dictates of conscience.

And so, passing on once more, from the merely animal up to the rational and moral creation, we find other principles still, of finer tone and yet more subtle working, superadded to all these.

Man, in the Theist's view, not the creature merely but the child of God, the undoubted lord of all other things and beings in this world, has a larger voluntary agency proportionate to his larger faculties. His *bodily* structure evinces, through a higher and more complicated organization indeed, the action of the same material and vital laws as the bodily structure of other animals. Comparative anatomy and physiology make this strikingly clear both in the resemblances and in the differences. His senses are analogous to theirs, but modified to suit his higher needs. Of instincts he too has a few (where reason would be too slow or hesitating), as those of self-preservation, parental affection, and perhaps some others. Then he has *intellectual* powers (with language as the great means of their expression and cultivation), by which he reads the works of God in creation and observes the laws of outward providence, before he turns his mind inward upon itself to observe the laws of providence there also. The exercise of these intellectual powers forms a large part of his happiness, and yet not his most characteristic good of all. For he has, above all, a *moral* faculty,—a conscience,—a faculty of discerning right and wrong (of which there is not a trace in the actions of any other creature on earth);—a principle which says to him, in still small voice, This is right; this you ought to do; this you have done well in doing;—That



is wrong; that you ought not to do; for having done that, you are self-condemned and self-abased.

Of all the human faculties, this moral sense or conscience is the divinest. It passes judgment upon the worth of everything else. It dispenses the highest pleasures and the most intolerable pains that human beings know. It is the source of their characteristic happiness, or characteristic misery, as human beings. Other creatures, as well as man, may suffer in body;—in a transient degree they may suffer in feeling (as the parent animal deprived of its young), but not in conscience. The being that has conscience, has a higher and wider range of voluntary agency. He has a responsible *Free-will*.

Man's faculty of free-will and voluntary agency, and his faculty of conscience, thus form the range of our present inquiry,—namely, into the providence of God *over human actions and characters*. Let us then endeavour to trace some of the laws which regulate man's moral agency, as the appropriate laws of Providence in this part of the Divine works. In this, as in the previous parts of our subject, we must seek to trace the operations of Providence (so far as they are observable by us) as acting *in* the inherent principles of human nature, not as separate from them or as forcibly controlling them. Providence in man *is* man's own essential nature as constituted and upheld by the Supreme Being. Providence *is* that moral constitution sustained in being, its laws carried into effect. And we shall find its laws such as are appropriate to this part of creation;—no longer material, mechanical and absolute, because here they have to do with free-will. The laws of man's moral nature that we have now to trace, are conditional, not absolute,—as they are spiritual, not material; attaching inevitable results to the use or abuse of his free agency, but of course not binding down that agency,—for how then should it be free?

What, then, are the leading characteristics of man's agency?

His bodily constitution exhibits the Creator's power as operating by similar laws to those which govern other animal natures. Those powers which make him a moral agent are the specific attributes of human nature. Without these, he would be subject only to the laws of animal life. Hence we conclude that the distinctive purpose of human existence is the exercise and formation of a moral character, sensible of the distinctions of virtue and vice, capable of the happiness of doing what is right, and subject to the miserable consciousness of having done wrong. Till this character is developed, man is not really man. He has not attained his true sphere of action and blessedness.

Do we ask, Why moral agency is man's appointed sphere? Why his specific and peculiar enjoyment is that of virtuous conduct, and why his worst evils are those of vice? As well might we ask why the mere animal has only animal pleasures and pains,

or why the vegetable obeys only the laws of vegetable life. As well ask why the plant is not a stone, why the animal is not a plant, as why man is more and better than either. Each order of creation has its appropriate place, its distinctive use, its characteristic nature, faculties, capacities; and as we rise in the scale of being, each higher order has larger powers of voluntary action and higher capacities for enjoyment. The new and wider sphere opened to man is that which is provided in his moral constitution. That this is his distinctive sphere of action and enjoyment, might be enough for us to know without inquiring further. But we are also abundantly convinced that his peculiar province as a moral agent is one of enlarged and elevated capacities for action and happiness.

Do we then ask, Why is not this moral developement given him at once? Why should not man have been formed by his Creator in full possession of that moral maturity from the first, which is fitted to be his ultimate attainment? The question is absurd to ask, and impossible to answer,—except, indeed, by analogies from every part of the creation. As well might we ask why the animal should be born and grow, and is not formed complete and mature at once. As well might we ask why the plant should be required to spring and grow under the influences of Providence in the powers of nature, and not start at once into its full strength and verdure without the intervention of seed or soil, of sun or rain. We are inquiring not how God in Nature *might have acted*, but how He does act;—not how His Providence might have been conducted, but how it is. What is, is open to our research; what might have been, is quite beyond our conjecture. Growth is, in point of fact, the universal law of organized natures,—of plants, of irrational creatures, and of rational man. Man has to grow not in body only, but also in soul. Such is the order of created beings. It is as vain as it is presumptuous to ask why this is so. Better admire how full the creation is thus made to be of energy, power and beauty, perpetual and all varied. Who shall attempt to speculate upon all the possible plans of creation and of providence, from which the actual one was selected? In point of fact (and it is with matters of fact that we have to do and with the theories involved in them), the great destiny of human existence is moral agency; and the moral character is not produced in us, any more than the bodily powers, mature and perfect at once; but it is developed by a gradual process in the order of Providence,—a process analogous to the Divine operations in the growth of other orders of beings. The infant has only the capacity for good and evil: of actual good or evil, it has neither. A moral character is gradually developed under the influence of education and circumstances; and increasingly from within, through growing reflection and voluntary actions recording themselves in habits.



This character is perpetually disciplined and operated upon, with various corrective or confirmatory influences, during the whole progress of life; and the enlightened observer regards all the outward circumstances of human life as important, principally in the effects which they are made or permitted, by the voluntary power of the mind, to exert upon the state of the mind itself. So that the true and ultimate business of life surely is, to develop more and more the moral faculties, and to discipline them to results which may stretch forward far into another state of being.

From the very nature of the case, in order to the growth of this moral character, there must be no outwardly compelling control over men's actions. Their characters are to be developed from within, while materials of good and of evil are presented without. Man must have freedom of choice amid besetting motives. His actions must be *his own*. His will must be free, so that his conscience, looking back, may approve or condemn. And because his will is free, he often does wrong, though scarcely without knowing or suspecting it. And many, instead of advancing in moral rectitude, seem to retrograde more and more hopelessly from it. Has, then, the law of God's moral providence failed of its object in such instances, shall we say? or shall we doubt whether there is a providence over man's conduct? If we looked only at the present life, and were content to argue as if there were no life beyond, I suppose we should count such moral failures as we do the failures in vegetable or animal growth,—the plants that never come to maturity, the young animals that pine away in disease or fall an early prey to their enemies. But as regards man, such a view cannot and need not satisfy us.

Here, indeed, as in almost every part of our argument, we lie under the disadvantage of partial knowledge. Would we thoroughly ascertain the laws of Providence in human nature, we ought to know much more than we do (even with the assistance of revelation) respecting the nature of our future life. Some orders of being we can trace through what we do not hesitate to regard as their full cycle of existence;—the vegetable, fulfilling the developement of which it is capable, securing the continuance of its species and then decaying, and its constituent parts entering into new combinations for new uses; the animal, living its life, enjoying its fill of happiness, reproducing its kind, and, without apprehension of death, dying. We may trace man's physical constitution through a similar course; but his moral nature we cannot. Its cycle is, apparently, not fulfilled when the laws of material nature in or about his body have caused that body's dissolution. Moral character (not to speak now of intellectual attainments also cut short),—moral character, the formation of which seems the highest purpose of his existence, is not perfected even in the best. And if it were perfected, its perfec-

tion would not intimate that his moral career was run, but rather that the time for his destined happiness was just then fully come. If, then, we could look into the secrets of the future life, we might perhaps see how this moral character, so variously commenced on earth and interrupted by death at such various points of its progress, may be further developed, and perhaps perfected, in another scene of being; and then, and then only, could we pronounce positively, from observation and fact, respecting the laws of Providence in human character. We might perhaps see the fair vision unfolded, which some of the most acute-minded philosophers and some of the best Christians have contemplated with delight, as a benevolent and devout theory,—that of a more powerful and often more painful discipline chastening and developing the moral faculties, correcting their false biases, and confirming their choice of what is right. We might see perhaps the enlarged knowledge of a more exalted state correcting at once those wrong volitions which spring from ignorance; and the awful punishments of desperate guilt at length subduing the most confirmed habits of sin, experimentally convincing the most hardened that there is no peace with the wicked, exciting remorse and then summoning forth penitence, and then inspiring the wish, the resolve, the effort of virtue. And then virtue might be seen, in the long distance, bringing its own reward in the sure sequence of an approving and more and more enlightened conscience, and the Scripture anticipation might at length be realized, that “God shall be all in all.”

If, I say, we could know all this as fact, which is the fervent faith of many, we might better understand the ways of Providence in the moral discipline of mankind. But, since the future life is not thus particularly unfolded to us, however well assured the believer in revelation may feel of the great doctrine itself, we must be content to trace the laws of this moral Providence over man as they operate at present, and draw our inferences cautiously as to their probable future operation. Yet, if upon careful observation we should find that there are laws even now in action for the developement of the moral powers in all human beings, by which (amid every variety of experience and discipline) virtue is prevailingly sanctioned and vice suffers many self-caused penalties,—and if we see that the ultimate moral results to which this process points are never perfectly attained on earth, but that the moral capacity when most improved admits of perpetual enlargement and culture still, without limits at present perceivable by us,—and if, from the present effects of enjoyment or suffering as connected with voluntary conduct, in making a sensitive being desirous of repeating that which produces happiness and shunning that which causes misery, we can venture to anticipate the natural and necessary effects of future rewards and punishments upon the human will;—then it does appear that something like what



we have called the vision of acute-minded philosophers and pure-hearted Christians, may be inferred with some degree of confidence from the present laws of Providence in our moral nature, read in connection with the simple hope of Nature or the clear promise of Revelation that this moral nature shall survive death.

But let us examine a little more carefully the operation of this Moral Providence as at present exercised over us.

Amid all the varieties of natural constitution and susceptibility that distinguish human beings from one another, and which seem, on a hasty view, to make it difficult to classify human actions or to philosophize upon their causes, we may trace, if we will, certain general principles universally prevailing, which we must regard as clear laws of Providence in our moral being. Every human being without exception has a *capacity for pleasure and pain* of various kinds. There are certain bodily sensations which are, in their own nature, painful; and there are certain others which are naturally pleasurable. And, if the philosopher were asked *why* the pleasurable sensation was to be preferred to the other, he would reply that he cannot assign these facts to any simpler or more comprehensive law of our nature, and that he therefore regards the capacity for pleasure and pain as an ultimate principle of human nature (indeed, of all animated natures), respecting which nothing more can be said. To prefer pleasure to pain is the same thing as saying that one is pleasurable and the other painful. We can simplify no further.

But pleasure and pain, in man, may arise not merely from the body, but from the *mind*. There may be unhappy, unquiet thoughts, reflections and feelings, as well as uneasy bodily sensations; and they are, with more reason still, the objects of dread. Every one seeks to be free from them, though the methods sometimes taken for that purpose may aggravate rather than relieve. What is to be particularly observed is, that the pleasures and pains most peculiar to man are those mental pleasures and pains which he experiences in the contemplation of his own voluntary conduct. These are the pleasures and pains of his moral nature. He may have bodily enjoyment or suffering, which, if quite unconnected with his voluntary conduct, produces neither self-satisfaction on the one hand nor self-reproach on the other. But if his conscious fulfilment of known duty has earned the pleasure, or his violation of it the pain,—if health has been sustained or strengthened by temperance, or sickness been incurred through indulgence,—then the comfort or suffering of the body, being connected with right or wrong conduct, brings moral pleasure or pain in addition to the physical. So he may have mental pleasure or suffering that does not arise from moral causes, and therefore does not reflect upon him self-satisfaction or reproach; as when the intellectual taste

is gratified or the wishes of natural sentiment or feeling attained, or when, on the other hand, the pains of intellectual doubt, difficulty and ignorance, or those of disappointed feeling or deferred hope, are experienced. Here are pleasures or pains of the mind; but they do not reach the conscience. But if the pleasure consist in the consciousness that his own volitions and actions have been good, or the pain in the consciousness that they have been evil, these are moral pleasures and pains respectively. And, according to the view now presented, it is chiefly by the annexation of these pleasures and pains to the voluntary conduct of human beings, that the purposes of Providence in their moral being are carried on; it is in this annexation that the laws of Providence in human characters and actions are to be traced. It is by connecting that class of actions and dispositions which are recognized as virtuous with happiness of a high order, even in the present life, that the laws of Providence guide us (as free agents can only be guided, not compelled) towards virtue. It is by connecting that class of actions and dispositions which are known as vicious with prevailingly evil experiences in the individual, that Providence deters (as free agents can only be deterred, not violently restrained) from vice. This is, in brief, God's moral government over man; exhibited at present in no slight degree; to be more plainly evinced, probably, hereafter. It cannot be denied that from this single principle of the desire of happiness and the dread of suffering, it is possible that the Author of our frame should (if He wills) ultimately guide every intelligent being to the realization of his best capabilities. That by such means He is continually inducing them to virtue and deterring from vice, is also plain. And that, by such means, more amply developed, He may ultimately lead them to the perfection of their moral nature, is a hope not destitute of foundation in the natural religion of the human heart.

Besides these retributions of conscience, there are other laws of Providence attaching reward and punishment to virtue and vice in the present life. Indeed, the moral conduct of men has a great deal to do in the production even of their outward blessings and misfortunes. There is not any rank or condition of life in which the scrupulous observance of the great virtues of industry, integrity, honour and prudence, is not, on the whole, beneficial in a worldly point of view, and the neglect of these virtues damaging to a man's success. There may be instances, indeed, of successful fraud; but such success is never safe and seldom permanent. "Honesty is," in the long run, by far "the best policy;" and if in any case it seem otherwise, the principle is a greater good than any policy.

But it is obvious that the temporal condition does not depend solely, nor even chiefly, upon the moral state. Though it is perfectly true that no condition is unaffected, even outwardly,



by the moral character of its occupant, yet the great outlines of a man's external condition are fixed by other causes rather than moral ones.

Nor should this perplex us. For we must not forget that there are other natures in the world besides the human, and other laws in action besides moral ones. Physical laws guide the material world, and the laws of animal life govern all animated beings. Amidst all these, and not by superseding them, room is to be found for a being subject to higher laws still. Man's moral agency is to go on in connection with the laws of matter and with those of life both in himself and in other beings, and his condition as regards externals is assigned in a great degree through the operation of laws beyond himself. And we may as plainly trace the operation, and as fully admit the importance in a moral point of view, of those laws which make man subject to many arrangements over which he has no control, as of those other laws by which he has a voluntary control over other things and beings. The developement of his moral faculties is not more promoted by those arrangements which make certain results to depend upon human will and effort, than by those which make other results to take place without human instrumentality, and, it may be, in opposition to human wishes or efforts. In the one case, God's purposes (perhaps for other beings as well as for man himself) are fulfilled through man's agency; in the other, His purposes for man are effected through the laws of other natures;—for all are parts of one great whole, and, as regards the moral discipline of human beings, we cannot say that either class of providential arrangements are more important than the other. What is beyond man's will to regulate, may beneficially sway his will. What he cannot control, may exert a salutary control over him. At one time, his will can influence his state; at another, his state must rule his will. And the one kind of discipline is, doubtless, as important to the developement of his moral character as the other. It is equally important that many things should be independent of human volition, as that certain other things should be contingent upon it. And the general laws of Providence in substances and beings foreign to man himself, are to each human being the motives and the means of action, just as much as those which connect happiness or suffering with voluntary conduct of his own. Through the combined action of all these laws in man himself and in other natures, the endless diversities of the human condition are produced,—diversities which occasion mutual duties and benefits, and diversities of moral character as varied as themselves. But our voluntary conduct in the circumstances thus assigned to us and not chosen by ourselves, is just as much the exercise and as much leads to the discipline of character, as the voluntary exertion of our efforts in things contingent upon our efforts. We must learn to *act*, and we must

also learn to *bear*. The passive virtues (as they are called,—the patient virtues would describe them better) hold as important a place in moral attainments as the active ones. What depends upon our own exertions to do, we must strive to do according to the moral law of God in our conscience. What comes to us without our agency or contrary to our efforts, we must strive to receive and to employ according to the spirit of the same divine will. In either case there is *volition* on our part. In either case we exercise a choice; in the one, the choice of what we will do or have; in the other, the choice how we will bear and use what is not permitted to us to choose or reject, or what has happened even in defiance of our choice and efforts. So in either case there is an exercise of moral character. And it is in ourselves, not in the circumstances,—it is in the moral qualities developed in us, not in the objects themselves as gained or lost, as enjoyed or suffered merely,—that the moral importance of all the experience of life consists.

It is not necessary, therefore, for the vindication of the Divine moral government, that we should be able to point out a constant and exact accordance in the present life between the moral character and the temporal condition. Indeed, the demand for this accordance, so often implied in objections to the equity of Providence, can scarcely be expressed in a presentable form. The two things required to be made proportionate have no proper relation of proportion or comparison. What can we mean by requiring that the outward condition should *correspond* to the moral character? The moral condition (of happiness or misery) may correspond to the moral character (of virtue or vice). But how is the temporal or outward condition to be proportionate to the moral character? What would a *moral* outward condition be? Is it wealth that is so described? Does the objection demand that a man's virtues should be compensated by pounds sterling, and that the latter should be an infallible test and measure of the former? This, or something like it, seems to be the central thought, obscurely seen by the objector himself who demands that Providence should adjust men's outward lot to their inward merits. Yet this would not proportion happiness to virtue, for happiness is certainly not in proportion to wealth.

A correspondence is indeed found, to a certain extent, between character and condition, just so far as we can trace a connection between voluntary conduct and outward results, both as a man becomes the architect of his own fortune and as he moulds his own wishes to the lot assigned to him by stronger influences than his own will. At the same time it is obvious to remark, that the *happiness* of life does not bear any kind of proportion to the distribution of what are commonly called by distinction "the good things of life," that is, its outward possessions. Never was more profound wisdom uttered than in those words of him of Naza-



reth, "A man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth." Many other considerations of far more importance go to make the real good of having, or to moderate the evil of not having. So that, if riches and length of days were assigned according to virtuous pre-eminence, the best might not always be on that account the happiest. They would still be the happiest as being the best; the correspondence between conduct and conscience would be then what it is now. And that part of the temporal blessings of Providence which, by the actual arrangements of the world, is made contingent upon virtuous conduct in any instance, is precisely that which produces the most happiness in attaining, and which to lose by one's own fault would cause real grief; but in that which is beyond voluntary effort and unconnected with virtuous conduct, the amount possessed is no criterion whatever of the good enjoyed.

It is the doctrine of Revelation that, in a future life, the allotment of happiness and misery shall be strictly proportionate to virtue and vice respectively, and unbroken by seeming inequalities external to the recipients. We may form some conception how this may possibly take place in a more spiritual state of existence, when we consider that our good and evil now arise in part from our own actions and partly from the independent operation of the laws of the outward world, and that it is by our animal constitution that we are connected with those laws. If, then (as St. Paul expresses it), that which is now an "animal body" is to be replaced by a "spiritual body,"—if we are to retain our intellectual and moral faculties without being still subject to the wants and necessities of that which is plainly mortal in our present frame,—then the immediate and constant adjustment of individual happiness or suffering to individual conduct and character, may be conceived as effected in the most perfect and constant manner, through the mere agency of individual consciousness realizing the good and evil of its own moral state, undisturbed and undisguised by pleasures or pains of any other kind.

Now this constant and unvarying conjunction of happiness and misery with moral desert and undesert, is declared by Revelation to await us all in the world to come. But this is, essentially, the kind of moral government which some seem disposed to regard as alone worthy of Divine wisdom and justice, when they demand why present (and perhaps outward) good and evil are not strictly allotted according to moral character. Let such, then, receive this as the more spiritual answer to their material-minded question:—that the most thorough retribution they can desire will be made manifest to all through the whole course of man's immortal existence, except its short beginning in the present world. And if they cannot exactly comprehend why this little exception should be made in the first instance, let them not

regard it, at any rate, as perceptibly deranging the general adjustment of the whole. Or rather let them consider that the temporary subjecting of mankind to other occasions of happiness and suffering besides those which are voluntary on their part, may be as important to the calling forth of character in beings so circumstanced, as the future and permanent exact retribution will be for producing the experiential confirmation of moral excellence and the confirmed abhorrence of moral wrong.

Some persons feel a great difficulty in reconciling, to their own satisfaction, the idea of God's universal providence and that of man's free-agency and responsibility.

How, they ask, is man a free agent, if God's providence guides him? How is man responsible for his actions, if those actions are subject to the laws of God?

How is he not? I reply. Responsibility is one of those laws. Where is the difficulty? unless, indeed, the objector is thinking (as indeed he most likely is) of material and constraining laws like that of gravitation, while we are speaking of the conditional laws of man's moral nature. I cannot indeed comprehend that there is any real difficulty in the matter, provided only that we really know our own meaning when we speak of God's providence on the one hand, and of freedom and responsibility as attaching to human agency on the other.

God's providence over man's actions and character is exerted through the medium (as we have already said) of laws specifically appropriate to the nature and purposes of human existence, those laws in fact constituting the inherent principles of human nature. The true purpose of man's existence is to attain moral excellence. The great law of Providence pointing to this end is, that pleasure and pain shall more and more, and ultimately shall intirely, coincide with the virtuous and the vicious volitions of a free agent. Is this, now, a sufficient idea of Providence as exercised over, or in, the moral conduct of mankind? And if so, does it not give a sufficiently clear idea of the nature of human agency and responsibility? What is free-agency, except the power of doing *as we will*?—a power which we are all conscious of possessing, limited by the laws of outward nature, limited by our own physical weakness, confronted by other wills, and controlled by the ascendancy of moral principle in our own wills. And what is responsibility, but the liability to reward or to punishment, to pleasure or to pain, according as what we have willed to do has been right or has been wrong—has been accordant with the laws of God in our better nature, or contrary to them? Under this view, there is plainly a Providence over us, and there is as plainly agency and responsibility on our part. These doctrines respecting God and man mutually imply each other. Providence acts in that human nature which the Creator made, as certainly as in every other department of creation, and it acts in



this instance with special regard to man's moral agency; while man's highest exhibition of free agency is shewn when he perceives by his intelligence and follows by his will the Creator's moral laws. And man's responsibility consists in his being subject to moral rejoicing or suffering according to these laws of God in his own nature and destiny.

The supposed difficulty in fact arises from a confused notion of the meaning of Law in connection with the operations of Mind. It is a lurking mechanical or materialistic idea of law (quite inappropriate to mental laws) that makes a man wonder how there can be liberty of choice and accountability of conduct, if God has given laws to the human mind, and if He (as most Theists maintain) foreknows the operation of those laws in each instance, and has (in a philosophical sense of language, but a sense very remote from its ordinary and popular meaning) *fore-appointed* the actions of human beings. From this confused notion, the whole controversy between what is called Philosophical Necessity and Philosophical Liberty appears to have arisen,—a controversy, to common perception, full of absurdity from beginning to end, in which the writers on both sides have always misunderstood the meaning of their opponents and seldom clearly understood (if we may judge from their having so inadequately explained) their own,—a controversy full of confusion, from words being used without definite meanings, or else with meanings different from their common usage, and having no manner of practical value, whichever side of the strictly metaphysical argument we may choose to take. When occasionally candid and clear-headed writers on both sides have taken pains to explain their respective meaning, they have found that they held exactly the same opinions in fact, and had only been engaged in a dispute as to the true way of expressing them. The phraseology of that dispute we therefore scrupulously avoid employing on the present occasion.

The whole Necessarian controversy depends, in fact, upon the standing-ground which we take in our attempted survey of human actions. The Necessarian attempts to look at them from the *divine point of view*, and is, as might be expected, giddy and confused with his daring flight; while the Libertarian is content to view them from the human standing-place of conscious free-agency and moral perceptions; and his view is practically right (as even the Necessarian allows), though he is not authorized to deny that a different theoretical standing-place is conceivable. When the Necessarian has said that human actions are necessary (from the divine point of view, that is), he has never meant that a man cannot help doing so-and-so, or that he cannot do as he chooses. He has spoken, somewhat too confidently perhaps, of human actions as seen from the throne of God, and as by the insight of God Himself. And when the Libertarian has said that

human actions are free, he has never really meant that they are beyond the laws of Divine Providence or the foresight of the Divine Mind. He has spoken humanly, and humanly he is quite right. He is only wrong if he in his turn presumes to say that future actions are as doubtful to the mind of God as they are to that of man.

The prime law of moral agency is, we repeat, a *conditional* law,—that virtue shall lead to inward, if not also outward good, and vice to inward, if not also outward, misery; that if men do well, they shall be accepted, and if ill, be punished. How can it be said that the doctrine of God's Providence interferes with this law? Is not Providence rather seen in the enforcing of the law? Would this adjustment of recompence to conduct take place more thoroughly if there were no Providence over man? The thought is absurd. Providence governs each order of beings according to their respective nature and sphere of action, and is traced, not as superseding, but as preserving, their distinctive qualities. It is because Providence still sustains the laws of matter that the earth still gravitates and still revolves. And precisely because Providence still sustains the moral law of recompence in the human soul, men's voluntary actions are visited, or will be, with retribution. The law of Providence in man, as read by man himself, is a *contingent* or *conditional* law. It says, *If* such a thing be done, such will be the consequence. It does not say, Thou wilt do the right by the force of electrical attraction, and be happy therein; nor, Thou shalt gravitate to the wrong and be inevitably wretched. How, then, does this law of Providence over human actions and their consequences (or, if we choose to call it so, this divine pre-arrangement and divine foreknowledge of human actions and their consequences) invalidate the fact, or throw doubt upon the propriety of that fact, that such consequences *are* connected with such conduct? The objection, duly sifted, would seem to amount to this,—that happiness ought not to be awarded to virtue, nor punishment to sin, *because* God hath pre-arranged that this connection shall subsist! This should be the meaning of the allegation,—that man cannot be a responsible being if there is a Providence over his actions! Was ever there such reasoning advanced? It is the very ground of our confidence that such awards will take place, and of our belief that it is right they should. The moral law is not a law of physical necessity or outward constraint, but of consequences conditional upon conduct.

But human conduct (it is still objected) is *fore-appointed* by the laws of God in his providence; where, then, can be the merit or the guilt of any action to earn praise or reproach, happiness or suffering? We must ask the objector what he means by "fore-appointed." Do you mean that your conduct was not voluntary? That it was not your own act and deed? That the



motives or feelings which you obeyed, and those which you resisted, were not in your own mind? That the sense of right and wrong which you followed or disregarded was not the attribute of your own conscience? Do you mean that a constraining power was exerted over you to prevent your doing what you wished (as gravitation prevents you from flying), or to compel you to do what you virtuously wished and strove to avoid? This is the gross, vulgar doctrine of absolute Predestination, as once held by English Calvinists and still held by Mahometans,—a doctrine utterly indefensible alike in theology and in metaphysics, and quite foreign to that of a Providence exercised in the laws of man's moral nature itself. The conduct is voluntary; it is our own; it is morally right or it is morally wrong; and it carries with it the award of good or evil accordingly. The less we perplex ourselves with the “divine decrees” (unrevealed as they are to us), the better for our philosophy and morality too.

And now there is one simple, plain consideration, so plain and simple that high-flying metaphysicians will despise it, and perhaps pity the man who can urge it as important, and yet more adapted to satisfy the practical doubts of earnest thinkers on these perplexed questions than any other that can be adduced. It is this: Be the Divine fore-knowledge, or the Divine fore-appointment, of human conduct (through the laws which govern it) what it may,—*that fore-appointment is not felt by our wills, that fore-knowledge is not known to our reasonings*, at the time when we decide how we will act. It is not, therefore, nor can it be, with us a reason, or a motive, or a determining influence in any way. Do you say: God knew that in such and such circumstances you would do wrong, and incur punishment for so doing? So, perhaps, some of your fellow-men pretty confidently expected from their knowledge of your character. But you did not know that such was the Divine fore-knowledge; nor was this fore-knowledge of God, nor the expectation of your fellow-men, your *reason* or *motive* for doing the wrong. God knew (and perhaps some of your human friends expected and believed) that in another instance you would do right, and earn the recompence of well-doing. But you did not know this Divine fore-arrangement. You did not do the right because God had fixed it in His prescience, but because He had commanded it in His precepts. You obeyed your own emotions in each case: your own passions in the one, your better moral principle in the other. Your action was just as much your own as if (could you conceive that possible) God had not known what you would do. Though, therefore, it seems impossible to doubt the Divine fore-knowledge of all things, and (in a special sense of that word) their fore-appointment; yet, as regards the decision of our conduct under any given circumstances, these

thoughts have no place. Let us weigh this practical consideration a little more carefully.

Should any one pretend to say when he is contemplating a wrong action, "It is fore-appointed that I shall do this," and hence seek a plea for doing it,—we must rejoin: Why do you not say to yourself instead, "It is fore-appointed that I shall do right," and so spurn the temptation from you with the word. The assumption of fore-knowledge on your part would be alike false in both cases; but while the bad *logic* would be equal, there would be *bad morals* in the one case and *good* ones in the other as the ruling motives; and there would be *misery* in the one case and *happiness* in the other as the results contingently clear at the moment of deciding. Think as you may of the fore-appointment as made on the part of God's hidden providence, it is *not* made *as regards yourself*, in any proper sense of language. God knew, indeed—but you did not—whether you would do right or wrong. You did not know till your will had determined; and you did not quite determine till you had studiously persuaded yourself by that sophistical and wicked argument. It was not God's fore-knowledge that determined your choice in that instance, for His fore-knowledge was all unknown to you. It was your own vice that found an excuse for self-indulgence, in a suggestion which cannot rationally be made a motive for any conduct whatever, but which, if appealed to at all, is just as strong a persuasion to virtue as you have made it a plea for vice. There is this essential difference, indeed,—that in making it a plea for vice, you plead for misery; while in making it a suggestion of virtue, you would be pleading for happiness. We cannot separate what the Author of our being has joined together. We may make choice of the conduct, but not of its consequences when we have chosen the conduct.

The Divine fore-knowledge, or fore-appointment (if that word, metaphysically explained, be preferred), is, we repeat, unknown to us. From the very nature of the case, we can know nothing about the law of *voluntary* actions and their consequences except as a contingent or conditional law. We cannot predicate the consequences till we know the conduct; and we cannot absolutely know the conduct till the will has made its choice. We can only know that *if*, or *when*, we do thus and thus, such and such will be the consequences; that if, or when, we do right, we shall be so far happy; and if, or when, we do wrong, we must so far suffer for it. We know the precept absolutely, the consequences conditionally.

And it is this conditional knowledge of our moral future that marks us out as free agents. We cannot imagine moral responsibility to exist under clear fore-knowledge of an absolutely ordained future. Instead of knowing that such and such will



and must be our actions, and resolving (as we then must) to abide the consequences;—we are merely enabled to know that such and such would be the consequences of this or that particular course of conduct, and are solicitous, therefore, to frame our voluntary conduct accordingly. We have a voluntary power to do or to forbear,—to do this or that; but we have no power to dissociate the consequences of having done well or having done ill. “If thou doest well,” the Lord said to the first murderer, “shalt thou not be accepted? And if thou doest evil, sin lies at (thy own) door.” “If thou art wise,” says the proverb (true in reference to our intire being, whatever doubts may attach to it if applied merely to the temporal and outward consequences of our actions), “thou shalt be wise for thine own good; but if thou scornest, thou alone shalt bear it.”

---

## THE SHADOW-LAND.

BY SIR JOHN BOWRING.

I HAD a dream—where Shadow-land  
Was stretch'd before me vast and grand;  
And yet so world-like was the view—  
All so substantial did appear—  
I doubted much if shades they were,  
Or I were not a shadow too.

There shadowy kings in shadowy robes  
Held shadowy sceptres, shadowy globes;  
And shadowy courtiers gather'd round  
The pomp that was all shadow. There  
Did shadowy chiefs, with martial air,  
Swagger and strut on shadowy ground.

In that mysterious land of shades,  
In shadowy mansions shadowy maids  
With shadowy brooms swept shadowy floors:  
There shadowy steeds with shadowy grooms  
Swung shadowy guests to shadowy rooms;  
With shadowy Swiss at shadowy doors.

A shadowy ship on shadowy seas  
Was wafted by a shadowy breeze  
Midst shadowy rocks, where shadowy birds  
Sat screaming. On a shadowy throne  
A shadowy spirit sat alone,  
And echoes thunder'd out his words.

"Our fable-mongers," said the sprite,  
 "In most mendacious myths delight,  
 And talk of worlds—and men therein,  
 Whose brains are hard—whose words are blows—  
 Who print a foot-mark from their toes,  
 And feel the scratching of a pin.

"Strange wretches these—if such there be—  
 Who, to a spirit's misery,  
 Add corporal pangs—condemn'd to know  
 Alike the agonies of sense  
 And agonies of intelligence—  
 A mortal's and immortal's woe ;

"Frozen by cold, and scorch'd by heat,  
 They tread the ground with weary feet,  
 And even the light is burthensome ;  
 They meet resistance everywhere,—  
 The land—the sea—the very air,  
 Is substance to be overcome.

"All—all is struggle, smart, and strife—  
 Resistance at the gates of life—  
 Through life resistance—and at death,  
 Resistance still ; each moment—hour—  
 A contest with an adverse power ;  
 And effort heaves the feeblest breath."

The spirit ceased—but as he ceased,  
 A wandering ghost, from earth released,  
 Over the doubting listeners flew.

"Too true!" in mournful tones, he said,  
 And hundred echoes vibrated,

"Too true, too true! Alas! too true!"

Then the dispersing shadows cried,  
 "Can so much woe on earth abide?  
 Are mortal men so doom'd?" And then,  
 With many a sympathizing sigh  
 And pitying look, they flitted by,  
 All whispering, "Miserable men!"

And then I roused me from my dream,  
 Much musing on the marvellous theme,  
 "And is it thus that Heaven's great plan  
 Is moving on!" I could not rest,  
 Nor still the tumult in my breast,  
 Nor solve *the mystery of Man!*

*Shanghai, July 29, 1854.*



## RELIGIOUS TEACHING IN OUR SUNDAY-SCHOOLS,

BEING THE SUBSTANCE OF AN ADDRESS READ BEFORE THE MANCHESTER  
SUNDAY-SCHOOL ASSOCIATION, GOOD FRIDAY, 1856,

BY MR. HARRY RAWSON.

THE desire to improve the character of our religious instruction, implies that we are dissatisfied with its present quality, and consider it to be inadequate to its proposed end. I believe that, in the greater number of Sunday-schools, little that is truly worthy of the name is either given or attempted. The estimate generally formed of the object is much too low, and utterly incapable of inspiring the degree of energy and effort which alone can achieve it. So, too, the means employed are equally scanty and unsuitable. The reading of the Scriptures (invaluable as an auxiliary, when judiciously employed) is regarded too often as the beginning and the end of religious education. The teacher would appear to consider his object attained when his class is occupied with the spelling out of a chapter, no matter from what portion of the volume selected. Of intellectual effort there is often little enough, but of moral and spiritual influence still less. The very fact of the division which prevails, in nearly all the schools of orthodox Christians at least, into Bible and Testament classes, is sufficient to shew on what an ill-considered basis the attempted instruction is conducted. The New Testament is the lesson-book of the lower classes, and from the reading of it advanced pupils are promoted to the Old Testament. What ideas such an arrangement is calculated to impart of the relative value to us of these great sections of the Bible, need not to this audience be pointed out.

The imperfections of the religious are equalled only by those of the secular element. Owing the bulk of their education to the same kind of influences, a large proportion of Sunday-school teachers are little prepared for the duties of their office. A dull, drowsy, uninteresting method is the natural consequence. Mispronunciations are allowed to pass uncorrected, or are replaced by others scarcely less objectionable. Difficult words are stumbled over, or spelled out with painful and laborious effort. Geographical allusions are unexplained; and the only knowledge which the pupils obtain of the great prophets and heroes of the Old Testament, is the difficulty of spelling and the impossibility of pronouncing their names.

Conformably to the title of this paper, I now proceed to indicate in order, the nature, method, and means of the religious instruction which it appears to me both desirable and practicable to impart in our Sunday-schools.—True, practical religion is founded upon and implies morality. No service can be acceptable to God which is not preceded or accompanied by the service of man. The sentiments of love and reverence to the Great

Creator, have their counterparts in those we entertain towards the earthly objects of our regard and affection, being but growths and expansions from them. The ever-watchful, tender solicitude of its mother, is the highest conception which a child can form of the love of God; whilst it sees His greatness and wisdom shadowed forth in the energy, wisdom, and authority of its father. A sound moral instruction lies at the root of the religious life, and is the only sure preparation for a consistent practice of Christian duty.

I am aware that this is by no means the popular view of the relations of religion and morality. By many it will be thought derogatory to the former; and it is by no means an infrequent practice to exalt the importance of the one by depreciating that of the other. To preach morality, is sufficient, in the estimation of many religionists, to warrant them in excluding from their Christian regards all who thus offend against their theoretical views, forgetting or overlooking the fact that the major part of the teachings of their great Exemplar consisted in the enforcement and illustration of the duties men owe to each other. The natural and lamentable consequences of such a view are obvious enough, in the moral backslidings of prominent professors which too often occur, bringing a scandal on religion, and causing the sceptical and indifferent to repudiate it as a sham, or to slight it as ineffectual for the purposes of life. Such Christians, indeed, severing in practice duties which are indissolubly connected and mutually dependent, commit, in principle, the same gross blunder as the Bedouin Arab, who devoutly prays for a blessing on his marauding expeditions, or as the brigands and assassins of certain countries, who combine an assiduous attention to their nefarious calling with a punctilious observance of the ceremonies of their church.

It would be easy to cite a great number of passages from the sacred writers, illustrative of the principle which I am desirous to develope. The futility of sacrifices unaccompanied by a merciful disposition and a pure heart,—the abomination of times and seasons of public worship unsanctified by the practice of justice and a humble walking before God,—the golden rule of doing as we would be done by,—the injunction to heal up any difference we may have with a fellow-man before invoking the blessing of Heaven,—and the declared imposture of professing a love of God whilst hating our brother,—all these, and a hundred instances besides, unmistakably shew the necessity of a sound state of moral feeling to render our approach to God an act at all less culpable even than positive impiety.

The principle that a thorough instruction in morals is a primary requisite for rational and acceptable religion, derives considerable force from the fact which all history vouches for, that men's conceptions of the nature and character of God depend



upon their own moral condition. A rude and barbarous people can conceive and worship only a cruel, partial, and sanguinary Deity. Some tribes of North-American Indians, we are told, seek to placate their offended god with the incense of burning tobacco, thus making the Infinite but a projection of the finite. In the same way, when they place beside a dead companion his rifle and provisions, their heaven is but an extension of the pursuits and pleasures of earth, where wider prairies and more abundant game shall yield eternal delights, and where the departed thinks,

“ — admitted to that equal sky,  
His faithful dog shall bear him company.”

If, then, acceptable worship is impossible, and religious profession a mockery, unless accompanied by the discharge of our obligations to each other,—and if our conceptions of God and a future life, and in consequence our ideal of duty and of hope, be base or dignified, degrading or inspiring, according to the degree of our moral cultivation,—it becomes, I submit, an obvious and paramount duty to lay a broad basis of moral instruction—to offer to the young clear and comprehensive views of their relations to their fellow-creatures—and to convince them that, sacredly important as are the duties of prayer and worship, the efficacy of these depends upon the faithful discharge, in the first place, of all those duties of justice, mercy and charity, which are the appointments of Providence, and the conditions upon which we both give and receive happiness on earth.

Care must also be taken to implant worthy and Christian ideas of the nature and attributes of God. His greatness and goodness should be expounded and illustrated from the laws of the moral and spiritual, as well as from those of the natural world. Especial pains should be taken to shew the certainty and inevitableness (if the expression may be allowed) of the consequences which flow from our actions. Most people have some acquaintance with the laws which prescribe the relation of our bodies to external nature. But their ideas and convictions of the same connection between our actions and their results, are much more vague, and of course less operative. Many a man who knows full well that he cannot play with fire without risking his safety, and is sufficiently alive to the fact that if he fall from a house-top he imperils his life, finds it comparatively an easy matter to seduce himself into the belief that he may cheat or tell untruths without incurring punishment, and that he may escape the consequences even of robbery and murder. Here is a wide and important field of most invaluable lessons, illustrations of which an intelligent teacher will find readily and in abundance.

Let no one be apprehensive for the spiritual life of a child thus instructed. The opposite course, of seeking first to stimu-

late his religious sensibilities, may engender spiritual pride, may make him a fanatic and an intolerant persecutor, injuring his fellows under the delusion that he is doing a service to God. But Christian characters can be reared only on the basis of an enlightened conscience and a benevolent heart. And it seems to me unquestionable, that an active moral life must induce, if not religious impressions, at least such a disposition as will be highly favourable to spiritual influences. One can hardly conceive that a man whose life is governed by the law of love, whose lips are unpolluted by falsehood, and whose heart is the abode of justice and charity,—that such a man can be otherwise than reverential towards the Great Father, of humble mind, and cheerful and undoubting trust in His unfailing goodness. He is of those who, doing the will of God, learn to know of Him. A willing service and a devout homage will be the unaffected expression of his soul. Responsive to every influence of nature, to every lesson of life, to every intuition of consciousness, praise and adoration will flow from him, spontaneous as the matin-song of the lark or the music of the rippling stream.

It will have been seen that I do not lay much stress on the expression, on the part of our scholars, of their religious emotions. The influences proposed are not calculated to bring out these in a direct or prominent form. And my reason is, that I do not consider such a result to be either natural or desirable. I would not seek, in seed-time, to reap the harvest. In the order of developement, I believe the devotional spirit to be the last, as it is the highest, product of the educator. The growth and strengthening of the physical powers, the awakening of the intellect, the unfolding of the moral sentiments, and the experiences of religious faith,—such I deem to be the order of cultivation prescribed by Providence, and therefore to be pursued by us. Confirmatory of this is the summary of the youthful life of Christ given by one of the evangelists: “And the child grew and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom; and the grace of God was upon him.” It is true that cases are to be found in abundance in the literature of some classes of Christians, of children of tender years manifesting the fervours and raptures of the saint of mature life, and giving confident expression to their hopes of a better world, in the technical language of theological systems and the stereotyped phraseology of their peculiar sect. But such instances, I think, are seldom to be relied upon. They are often but the forced and transient product of a heated atmosphere of religious agitation, and cannot be regarded as the normal condition of natural and well-developed character.

With regard to the *mode* of teaching religious truths, our first remark is, that it should not be direct or ostentatious. There should be no appearance of a set purpose of driving and drilling



them into the minds of the pupils, as though it were said, "Come, now, let us talk about morality,"—or, "Now let us sit down and discourse upon religion." The only result of such a method as this would be a stiffness and formality which would at once defeat the object in view. The feelings are not thus to be called up and lectured, as a pedagogue summons a truant urchin to impress upon him a conviction of the enormity of his transgressions. The most sacred emotions are, both in young and in mature life, often the most fleeting and uncertain in their visitations. Like the wind, blowing where it listeth, we cannot tell whence they come nor whither they go. They often take possession of us when we least expect them, and refuse to lend their hallowing influences when most earnestly we invoke their presence. The *direct* is in many cases the least perfect method of attaining our ends in the moral world. The man who makes pleasure the pursuit of his life, is distanced by some humble-minded Christian, who, thinking only of his duty, unconsciously finds it his happiness also. Celebrity is often vainly sought, at enormous expenditure of time and wealth, whilst the simple and single-hearted

"— do good by stealth,  
And blush to find it fame."

There should be, then, no appearance of effort in our teaching; but occasions should be watched for and taken; and when the sympathies are awakened by the interest of some sacred story, by a stirring passage in history, or an incident in the teacher's own experience,—then should the inference be drawn, the moral pointed, and the lesson carried home to the heart and the conscience.

It is very desirable that the instruction should be conveyed in a lively and cheerful tone. No error has been more pernicious than that of connecting religion with gloomy and repulsive ideas. It is looked upon by great numbers of people as a sort of surly policeman, who grudges them their pleasures, and would be glad to "bring them up" for enjoyments and gratifications in which they can see no harm. The religious world is itself much to blame for this; and the controversy now pending on the Sabbath question will, I fear, do little to bridge over the gulf, already too wide, between Christianity and the people. It has been, unfortunately, the common practice to accept austerity as evidence of devotion, and to think that to be pious it was necessary to be morose. Let the teacher do all he may to disabuse his pupils of all such mischievous and pestilent errors. One of our sacred poets has sung,

"Religion never was designed  
To make our pleasures less."

And I fully agree with the proposer of a more positive form of putting this truth, by saying,

"Religion ever was designed  
Our pleasures to increase."

For he who has never experienced an increase in his innocent pleasures, and a zest which of themselves they did not possess, by the elevating influences of a devout frame of mind, is of those "who know not what spirit they are of." Within the limits of propriety, therefore, I would gladly allow an engaging and attractive manner in the intercourses of teacher and pupil. I would not disdain the enlivening effect of anecdotal illustration,—borrowed, it may be, from the pages of a Boz,—nor, however lame it might be, frown disapproval on an occasional extempore pun.

The catechetical mode of tuition has many recommendations, which render its occasional use very advisable. It is advantageous, when a lesson has been given, with such remarks and illustrations as the teacher can command, to review the whole, and to throw the information he has imparted into an interrogative form. Such a plan serves to arouse attention, displays to what extent the lesson has been profitable, and often accomplishes the important end of ascertaining a pupil's difficulties,—there being much in the maxim, that "to know a disease is half its cure," which is specially applicable to the art of the instructor.

The use of the Bible as a means of moral instruction and religious impulse, here presents itself for consideration. I should have been glad to enlarge upon it, but our time will not admit of this. As a lesson-book for mere reading, it should never, in my opinion, be employed. The elements of language would be much more readily acquired from other books specially prepared for that purpose. The Bible ought to be reserved for occasional use, and be made to assist the teacher mainly in the elucidation and enforcement of spiritual truths. Rightly to appreciate its value, however, some knowledge of its history, geography, and of the habits and customs of the singular people to whom its teachings were originally addressed, is indispensable. The relative position of the different countries, provinces, cities and villages referred to in its narratives, should be made the subject of frequent and careful instruction. Nothing so much invests a passage with a sense of *reality*, as an acquaintance with its geographical allusions. I know not whether my experience be in this respect singular, but I have frequently found it a chief difficulty to overcome the vague, dreamy feeling with which Biblical narratives seem to be read, and to rouse and maintain the attention, during their perusal, to something like the interest and excitement which the same pupils would display whilst reading a passage in modern history or a newspaper report. In this respect, the map is an invaluable ally. Certainly, the map of Palestine, at least, should be in familiar use. The pupils should be led to see why, in travelling from "Galilee to Jerusalem, Christ must needs go through Samaria," and what are the topographical reasons for the expression, that "a certain

man went *down* from Jerusalem to Jericho." Rome and Corinth, Nazareth and Bethlehem, should represent ideas of actual places as definite as those of London and Paris. So, before beginning to read the Epistles to the Galatians, Thessalonians, &c., the places from which they derive their names should be distinctly pointed out.

Explanations of the etymological meanings of some of the proper names, or other frequently recurring words, I have often found to be of great service, shedding an unexpected light on many that looked but antiquated and inexpressive. The derivations of such terms as *gospel*, *disciple*, *apostle*, *Messiah*, and others, should be given; and they will always prove interesting and instructive in a high degree.

A number of other important topics will require the attention of the careful teacher, affecting both the matter and the manner of his instructions. As opportunity serves, he will shew the reasonableness of religion and its necessity to man, as evidenced by the constitution of his nature and the history of his race. He will exhibit the compatibility of faith with the most active exercise of the intellect, and point out the distinction between the letter that killeth and the spirit that giveth life. The nature of the inspiration of the sacred writers will demand some notice, if the lessons are truly suggestive; and will not be avoided, if the teacher be truly honest. He will not forget to expose the errors of popular views, and the fallacies of that numerous class who make the abuses of religion their reason for rejecting its offices, and, because bishops may be mercenary, refuse to look upon it as anything but a system of extortion and aggrandizement. He will shew that Christianity is no more responsible for the wars and oppressions which have been carried on in its name, than is Liberty for the cruelties, or Philosophy for the absurdities, that they have been employed to cloak and to sanction. The people are repelled from Christian communion as much by errors of this kind, as by any want of sympathy or capacity for spiritual exercises. I have conversed with many working men whom the practical infidelity of religious professors has kept aloof from our churches, and who, whilst declaiming against Christianity (as they have been taught erroneously to regard it) as an organized conspiracy against their social and political rights, have yet no language but that of reverence for the character, and of admiration for the teachings, of Jesus Christ. If these pernicious errors are to be destroyed, and true religion to progress among the classes to whom it was originally preached, it must be presented to the young as a *reasonable* service, demanding no surrender either of reason or any other gift of God, and in which there may be a unity of spirit amidst the widest diversities of intellectual beliefs.



## SOME ACCOUNT OF PRESBYTERIANISM IN ROCHDALE:

BEING THE CONCLUDING PORTION OF THE LAST SERMON (FROM JOHN vi. 31)  
PREACHED IN THE BLACKWATER-STREET CHAPEL, ON THE EVENING OF  
SUNDAY, FEB. 3, 1856, BY THE REV. WILLIAM SMITH.

WE come, now, to the particular history of this congregation. As I have already informed you, it originated with the ejection, from the vicarage of Rochdale (Aug. 24th, 1662), of the Rev. Robert Bath, the incumbent.

Mr. Bath, whose wife was a niece of Archbishop Laud, after holding his living upwards of thirty years, surrendered it rather than conform to the terms of the Bartholomew Act. After his ejection, he preached at a place called Underhill, a secluded spot amongst the hills of this neighbourhood, whither he retired to secure himself from the persecution which followed the passing of the Act of Uniformity. He ultimately settled in a small house at Deepleach Hill, where he continued to preach until his death, in 1674. I find farther mention of him as one of the divines assisting at Bury, August 4, 1652, in the ordination of Mr. Oliver Heywood, the celebrated Nonconformist minister of Coley chapelry, in the parish of Halifax. Mr. Bath died at the age of 70 years.

It will not be out of place to observe here, that the Puritan spirit would seem to have taken early root and strong hold in Rochdale. For it is on record that, at the conference between the heads of the Prelacy and the chiefs of the Puritan party, held at Hampton Court soon after the accession of James I., the case of Mr. Midgeley, a predecessor of Mr. Bath, "was brought especially before the King." It appears that Mr. Midgeley "objected to some of the ceremonies" enjoined by the Canons of the Church. But he could obtain no relief. He was prosecuted for Nonconformity by his ecclesiastical superior, the Bishop of Chester, "deprived" of his incumbency, and "degraded from the ministry" of the Church by law established. Another indication of the early prevalence of the Dissenting spirit here, exists in the circumstance that, of the twenty-two laymen who, with ten ministers, constituted the first classical Presbytery of Bolton in 1646, six were from this parish. Their names were, Edward Butterworth, of Belfield, Esq.; John Scolfield, of Castleton, yeoman; Emanuel Thompson, clothier; Sam. Wylde, mercer; James Stot, of Healey, gent.; and Robert Pares, gent.

Along with Mr. Bath may be ranged Mr. Zachariah Taylor, who had been curate of the parish, but who was ejected from that office in 1662. After his deprivation, he opened a school at Rochdale; thence he removed to the mastership of the school at Bolton, founded by Mr. James Lever, of London, whose representative at the present day is, I believe, Mr. Robert Andrews, of Rivington, a steadfast adherent of the Nonconforming

cause. Mr. Taylor afterwards transferred himself to a celebrated seminary at Kirkham-in-the-Field, where he died Feb., 1692, aged 74 years.

The next whom we may name amongst the founders of Nonconformity in this town is the Rev. Henry Pendlebury. He was a native of Jokim, in the parish of Bury, at the grammar-school of which place he received the rudiments of his education. Thence he passed to Christ's College, Cambridge, where he graduated. He preached first at Ashworth chapel, where he continued on probation about a couple of years. In 1650, he was formally set aside to the ministerial office; and the Rev. Robert Bath, of Rochdale, was one of the elders associated with his ordination.

Mr. Pendlebury, after this, appears to have ministered awhile at Horwich chapel. In 1661, he removed to Holcomb chapel, near Bury, from which preferment he was ejected, the following year, by the operation of the Act of Uniformity. He did not, however, relinquish the exercise of the ministry, but officiated in the neighbouring places with much acceptance during the remainder of his life. It is difficult to determine whether, after his ejection, he had any precise settlement. A temporary place of worship was built for him in Bass Lane; but it would seem as though Rochdale were, more than any other place, favoured by his ministrations; for on the title-page of two of his works he is described as minister of Rochdale. He died in 1695, at the age of 70.

To these three labourers in the Lord's vineyard we may ascribe the foundation of Nonconformity here. Robert Bath, Zachariah Taylor and Henry Pendlebury, were, undoubtedly, the first three preachers to the Nonconforming worshipers in this town. And, although somewhat of obscurity involves the early history of Nonconformity, so much remains on record concerning these three witnesses to a purer Christianity, as to place what I have stated respecting their association with the origin of this congregation beyond question.

The obscurity to which I refer is not to be wondered at, when we consider the circumstances of the times. The promoters of Nonconformity were, by the intolerant policy and unjust legislation of their age, compelled to court obscurity. To have obtruded themselves upon public notice, would have been to have become subject to penal informations, fine and imprisonment.

Moreover, as serving to account for the absence of clearly-marked intelligence in the primeval annals of Nonconformity, it is necessary to remember that some years would elapse after the Bartholomew Act before anything approaching to settlement and organization would characterize the proceedings of the Nonconformists. Under the operation of the persecuting policy of

the government of that period, it was impossible for this body of primitive Dissenters to be in any other than a fluctuating and irregular state. Nothing like settled discipline and system would for a while distinguish them. They were not (because they could not be) at first formed into regularly constituted societies. They would inevitably subsist in that undetermined condition which is most unfavourable to the creation and preservation of authentic records. Herein are the sources of the degree of uncertainty attaching to the first thirty or forty years of the transactions of Nonconformist congregations.

With the death of Pendlebury, we arrive at a period when this obscurity in a great measure vanishes. The Revolution had taken place, and many relaxations of the extreme course hitherto pursued in regard to Nonconformists was the result of that great event in English history. Some of these are, no doubt, traceable to that natural reaction which always takes place in the public mind in favour of the victims of an unjust and unreasonable severity. But more of this leniency may be attributed to the political circumstances of the country at that critical season, which of themselves were sufficient to cause a mitigation of the rigour with which the Nonconformists had been treated. The new order of things was not so firmly fixed as to despise the countenance and active support of so considerable a party as that which comprehended the Dissenters from the Establishment, whose interests and whose principles both, contributed to range them on the side of the Revolutionary government.

Besides, William, whom the Act of Settlement had seated on the throne of the Stuarts, and whom his education as a Calvinist had not infected with the intolerance of the bigot and the bitterness of the priest, like his great predecessor, Cromwell, knew and practised well the art of rendering available to the State the mutual jealousies of sects and the rival enmities of partizans. Thus was the weight and importance of the Nonconformists augmented; and their increase of influence so accruing became a main element in the improvement of their position as religious worshipers, after other than the way of Parliamentary models. Henceforth the impediments that beset the investigation of their early history cease to attend the path of the inquirer, and the succession of their ministers and the fortunes of their congregations are capable of being determined with comparative ease and accuracy. Legal documents and chapel records come into existence, creating facilities to the antiquarian which materially assist his efforts and promote the object of his researches.

The successor of Pendlebury in the ministerial office at Rochdale was the Rev. Joseph Dawson, one of four sons, all brought up to the ministry, of the Rev. Joseph Dawson, who was ejected from Thornton chapel. The youngest of these four sons, the Rev. Eli Dawson (of whom we have a record in our chapel



documents as having preached one of the lectures here established by the will of Mrs. Jane Whitworth) had seven sons, six of whom he educated for the ministry; but they all eventually left the profession for which they had been prepared. Four of these sons afterwards conformed.

Whether the Rev. Joseph Dawson was the immediate successor of Mr. Pendlebury, I cannot with certainty affirm. But I think it probable that he was so, and for these reasons: first, that I know of no record of any intervening minister; and, secondly, because in the will of Mrs. Jane Whitworth, bearing date Jan 3rd, 1704, I find him mentioned not only as minister here at that time, but also designated in such terms as to imply his exercise of the office for some considerable period before that date.

In this instrument he is nominated by the testatrix to preach her funeral sermon. He would not have been so specified had he been but newly settled with the society. The nomination in question imports his possession of the very high regard of the testatrix, a sentiment which it would be the work of time to produce. We may, therefore, not without sufficient reason, conclude that the exercise of his ministerial functions in connection with this congregation would commence soon after Mr. Pendlebury's decease.

Mr. Dawson was ordained at Rathmel, in Yorkshire, June 7, 1693; and at the time of his ordination, and probably for a brief space after it, he appears to have been preaching at Harford, near Richmond, in the same county. It was whilst in this neighbourhood that he formed the acquaintance which led to his marriage with the daughter of the Rev. Thomas Dixon, the ejected minister of Kirk Kellow, in Durham. From Harford, Mr. Dawson removed to Rochdale, where he died April 14th, in the year 1739, aged 72 years. He lies interred in the burial-ground "about the chapel at Morley, by far the oldest building in Yorkshire appropriated to Nonconforming worship," of which place his father had been minister twenty-one years. In this ground are many memorials of the Dawson family, amongst which is one commemorating "Thomas, only son of Mr. Joseph Dawson, of Rochdale, born Dec. 13, 1702; deceased Nov. 3, 1706." Mr. Dawson had three daughters who survived him, one of whom left an interesting diary, in the possession, I am informed, of the Rev. Joseph Hunter, of the Record Office, London. Another of these daughters became the ancestress of the Naylor of Altrincham, a family still true to the good old cause of Nonconformity with which their fore-elders have been so long and honourably associated.

During Mr. Dawson's protracted ministry at Rochdale, the present chapel was erected, on a piece of "waste or void land called the Colepitt Garden," given, in 1716, by John Smethurst,

yeoman, but which originally formed a part of the possessions of the Heywoods, of Heywood, a noted Puritan family in the neighbourhood. October 17th, 1717, the edifice raised on this piece of ground was registered, at the quarter sessions held at Manchester, "a meeting-place for an assembly of Protestants dissenting from the Church of England." This building I discover, by a minute in the chapel papers, to have been enlarged in 1743, by the addition at this, the eastern end, of "a bay of building."

The present place of worship, however, is not the original one. It is obvious, from Mrs. Jane Whitworth's will, that in 1704, and perhaps for some time before, another meeting-house existed; but the terms in which it is referred to afford no clue to its locality. This only is certain, that there was at that period another place of assembly belonging to the Nonconformists, and that it did not occupy the site on which this building stands. It is not unlikely to have been in a portion of the Lower Yates property. It seems from the deeds that a part of that property at the time consisted of "chambers;" and the name, "Amen Corner," appertaining to the vicinity, would appear to confirm the conjecture; for the Presbyterians of those days employed a clerk to signify the assent of the congregation to the devotional utterances of the minister.

Following Mr. Dawson was the Rev. Richard Scholefield. He was the son of Radcliffe Scholefield, of Radcliffe, and father of the Rev. Radcliffe Scholefield, "thirty years pastor of the congregation assembling in the Old meeting-house," Birmingham. Their common ancestor was the Rev. Jonathan Scholefield, "many years minister at Heywood chapel, whence, in 1659, he removed to Dowgles (Douglas?), from which he was ejected in 1662." His name appears in the list of ministers of the first classical Presbytery of Bolton, constituted in 1646, and he is therein described as "of Bury."

The Richard Scholefield who succeeded Mr. Dawson, whose son-in-law he was, having married his second daughter, Elizabeth, Jan. 8, 1728-9, was settled, first at Whitworth, then at Ringhay, in Cheshire, whence he removed to Rochdale, where he died, after exercising the pastorate about a year. It would seem, however, that Mr. Scholefield had officiated for some time before as assistant to his father-in-law, since his signature occurs, in 1734 and 1735, along with Mr. Dawson's, in the annual audit connected with the administration of the chapel funds.

This brings us to 1740, or perhaps 1741. The Rev. Josiah Owen, a nephew of Dr. Charles Owen, of Warrington, then took charge of the congregation. His first settlement was at Bridgnorth, which place he left in 1735. He afterwards resided at Walsall, and preached for a time at Stone. He was a man of great scholarship, wit and notoriety, taking an active and leading

part in the Jacobite controversy of his day, and being, indeed, the literary chief of the Whig or liberal party in this neighbourhood. He was a copious author, and one of his publications, a sermon entitled "The End of all Perfection," was preached in this chapel, June 29th, 1746, on the death of Mr. Jas. Hardman, merchant, to whose enlightened spirit and munificent intentions (afterwards carried into effect by his posterity) we owe the Moss School and the provision made for its maintenance.

In all likelihood it was Mr. Owen's celebrity and ability that so increased the congregation as to necessitate the enlargement of the chapel, of which I have spoken as taking place "in April and May, 1743, by agreement of the Trustees." It is somewhat singular concerning such a man that we possess so few authentic data respecting him. The year of his death is surrounded with some uncertainty. Opposite "June 14, 1752," in one of the old account-books, I find this entry: "Last day Mr. Owen preached." From the entries that follow, it may be inferred that Mr. Owen had a lingering sickness previous to his decease; for there is a list of payments for supplies from June to December. On the 11th of Dec. is a minute of a sum of money "paid to John Clegg, Shawfield, for Mr. Owen," by which we may suppose him to have been still surviving. After this, in December, we have two more entries of money on account of supplies; and then, on the 23rd of the same month, a minute of expense incurred for cleaning the minister's house: following this, Jan. 1, 1753, comes another item of the same kind, "for the men unloading the goods,"—I conclude, of the incoming minister. So that there need be little doubt that Mr. Owen's death occurred towards the close of Dec., 1752. In the mortuary registers of the parish church, which I have searched, I have been unable to meet with any record of his decease.—Mr. Owen's signature, as witness, is appended to two of the chapel deeds executed in 1746.

After Mr. Owen, we have as minister the Rev. Thomas Hopkins, whose name appears as one of the supplies during the illness of his predecessor. His ministry was a very brief one. He died Aug. 9th, 1754, and his funeral sermon was preached, on the 18th of the same month, by Mr. Braddock, of Bury. He lies interred in the south aisle of the chapel. Mr. Hopkins was a student at Carmarthen, and was settled first at Middlewich, and next at Northwich, before he came to Rochdale.

The Rev. Richard Bolton is the next minister on the roll. His ministry appears to have terminated in 1772. Of him I have not been able to glean any farther particulars.

The Rev. W. Hassal was appointed minister in 1773. In the interval between Mr. H.'s appointment and the vacancy occasioned either by Mr. Bolton's decease or by his removal to a new sphere, the congregation appears to have depended on supplies. Mr. Hassal was obliged after a time to relinquish his charge, owing to a failure of voice. He then opened a school, which he



conducted for several years with great success. After a residence here of more than fifty years, he retired to Manchester, where he died, Feb. 6, 1829, aged 78 years. He was interred in this chapel-yard, just in front of the main entrance to the building. Of Mr. Hassal's numerous family, one son and one daughter, I believe, still survive,—the former resident at New York, and the latter at Melbourne, in Australia, where, with her husband and family, she is known as a zealous upholder of the principles of Nonconformity.

In 1776, the Rev. Mr. Cooke was chosen to fill the vacancy occasioned by Mr. Hassal's loss of voice. In May, 1778, Mr. Cooke's connection with the congregation ceased. He was once (whether before or after his settlement at Rochdale is not quite clear) the minister at Preston. He changed his profession, graduated at Leyden, and practised afterwards as a physician in London.

In 1778, the Rev. Thomas Threlkeld was nominated minister in Mr. Cooke's place. He was the son of the Rev. Samuel Threlkeld, of Halifax. He received his education first at Daventry and finally at Warrington. In 1762, he settled at Risley, where he remained until his removal to Rochdale, where he continued till his death, April 6, 1806. With his wife, who survived him but a very short time, he is buried here, within the chapel and near the foot of the pulpit stairs. The most remarkable feature in connection with Mr. Threlkeld was his extraordinary memory and the pre-eminent power of acquiring languages which he possessed. Notwithstanding, however, his ability to recal names, dates, incidents and facts long since passed, he was quite incapable of delivering a sermon otherwise than by very close reading of his manuscript. It is also memorable respecting him that he was groomsman to the celebrated Dr. Priestley on his marriage, at Wrexham, to the daughter of a Mr. Wilkinson, an ironmaster in North Wales.

From 1806 to 1810, the Rev. William Marshall, who came from Loughborough, ministered to the attendants of this place of worship. From 1810 to Feb. 3rd, 1812, the Rev. Richard Astley was the officiating minister, this being his first charge after completing his academical course at York. He removed to Halifax, thence to Gloucester, and ultimately to Shrewsbury. Here, in 1853, owing to increasing infirmities, he resigned his office, retiring to Stourbridge, where he died, March 19, 1855, after having just completed his 70th year.

From Feb. 3rd, 1812, to Sept. 5th, 1813, the pulpit here seems to have been vacant, and the congregation dependent upon the services of neighbouring ministers. With the latter date, the appointment of the Rev. Peter Wright commences; but his ministry only lasted till the same date of the following year, 1814, when he accepted an invitation to preside over the Presbyterian society at Stannington, near Sheffield. At this place he died in 1854.

At the close of the year 1814, the Rev. Gilbert Elliott undertook the charge of the congregation. His ministry extended to 1826, when he removed to Prescot, where he died. Mr. Elliott, I have heard, originally adopted the military profession.

To him succeeded the Rev. Franklin Howorth, who, in January, 1832, settled as pastor of the Silver-Street chapel, Bury. His connection with that society and with the Presbyterian denomination has been lately severed by his profession of Trinitarian sentiments.

The Rev. George Heavyside followed Mr. Howorth. He died February, 1840, and lies interred in the chapel-yard. His only son is now preparing for the Unitarian ministry at the Manchester New College, London.—The Rev. George Winchester Philp, who, in December, 1842, suddenly announced his conversion to Trinitarian views, comes next in the succession of ministers to this chapel. He did not, however, long survive his avowed change of sentiments. After a preparation at St. Bees for the ministry of the Established Church, he died, before his assumption of the office.—The last appointment to the ministry here commenced with the first Sunday of May, 1843.

Thus, in the course of now nearly two centuries, the principles of Nonconformity in this town have had nineteen ministerial representatives. Great changes have taken place during so lengthened a period, and the congregation has passed through many vicissitudes. I have heard a member of and munificent benefactor to this society, deceased since my own settlement with it, state, on more than one occasion, that during his connection with the congregation, extending over an interval of sixty years, he had known it twice reduced to so low an ebb as two members.

Nevertheless, whilst men decay, principles survive. Truth never dies, and never can die out. It is of the Divine nature itself, and, like the nature of which it partakes, imperishable. God Himself is pledged to maintain it. Wisdom, we may be well assured, will be justified of all her children. It will always have its response in the best sympathies of the human heart. There was a time when the kingdom of God and of his Christ comprised but two or three gathered together. The rights of conscience which we impersonate, the duty of private judgment which we continue to enforce as a sacred heritage bequeathed to us by them of old time, are based upon a rock against which no circumstances, however hostile, can permanently prevail.

“Our fathers,” who were the exponents of liberty of thought and action in religious affairs, “did they not eat manna in the desert?” Did they not go forth, strong only in their sense of truth and right, to do battle with principalities and powers? And did not the issues of Providence ultimately vindicate their efforts in the cause of human freedom, “as it is written, He gave them bread from heaven to eat”?

## INTELLIGENCE.

LAYING THE FOUNDATION-STONE OF A  
NEW UNITARIAN CHAPEL AT ROCHDALE.

The Presbyterian chapel which lately stood in Blackwater Street was the most ancient Nonconformist place of worship in Rochdale. It was not the original meeting-place of the followers of Messrs. Bath and Pendlebury, divines ejected in 1662, having been built as late as 1717, during the ministry of Rev. Joseph Dawson, and enlarged in 1743, during that of the noted Josiah Owen. The dilapidated condition of this edifice, and its unsuitableness to modern taste and other ecclesiastical buildings in the town, induced the trustees and congregation nearly two years ago to devise means for erecting another and a better place of worship. A subscription was commenced, which with the aid of neighbours and friends amounts to £1825, and to which considerable additions may be expected. The last religious services were celebrated in the old chapel on the 3rd of February, when two suitable sermons were preached by the minister, the Rev. William Smith. The evening sermon contained a brief historical sketch of Presbyterian Nonconformity, and the succession of its ministers in Rochdale, the substance of which appears in another part of our Magazine. Contracts have been entered into with the Messrs. Cheetham for the erection of a new chapel at the cost of about £2000. The building having been raised to the base course, the congregation invited their friends to attend the ceremony of laying the corner-stone on the afternoon of Wednesday, April 23rd. The old site is used, with additions, and the new building will be larger and in every respect more convenient. During the progress of the building, the Blackwater-Street congregation will worship with their neighbours in Clover Street, under the ministry of the aged and worthy Mr. Wilkinson, one of those numerous converts from Methodism who embraced Unitarian Christianity about a quarter of a century ago. Between the two ministers and their congregations the most cordial feelings exist. The day fixed for the ceremony proved beautifully fine, and a considerable muster of friends assembled from Bury, Todmorden, Dukinfield, Manchester, Sheffield, Stand, Heywood, Oldham, Liverpool and Newchurch.

The ministers who attended to support the Rev. William Smith were Revds. J. Wilkinson, F. Baker, R. B. Aspland, John Cropper, Charles Robberds, John Wright, Brooke Herford, Geo. Hoade and Lindsey Taplin.

The public proceedings took place about four o'clock in the afternoon, and appeared to excite great interest, every available spot of ground, and every neighbouring window which commanded a view of the ceremony, being crowded with spectators. The service began with the following hymn, in the singing of which many of the spectators took part.

This stone to Thee in faith we lay;

We build the temple, Lord, to Thee!

Thine eye be open night and day,

To guard this house and sanctuary.

Here, when Thy messengers proclaim

The blessed Gospel of Thy Son,

Still by the power of his great name

Be mighty signs and wonders done.

Thy glory never hence depart!

Yet choose not, Lord, this house alone;

Thy kingdom come to every heart,

In every bosom fix Thy throne.

Mr. Wood, the Chairman of the Building Committee, then placed in the hands of Mr. George Holt, of Liverpool, a beautiful mallet made of satin wood and inlaid with mahogany, the gift of Mr. Snowdon, of Rochdale, and a silver trowel, the gift of the ladies of the congregation, and said that he, as the representative of the congregation, had great pleasure in presenting, and he had no doubt Mr. Holt felt equal pleasure in accepting, the mallet and trowel, the latter being the gift of the ladies of the congregation, which they wished him to keep as a memorial of his very acceptable services as master mason on the occasion of laying the foundation-stone of the new Unitarian chapel. He had no doubt Mr. Holt would prove in the office he had undertaken a good and faithful workman.—Mr. Holt received the gifts with suitable and courteous acknowledgments, and proceeded to use the trowel in the manner usual on these occasions. The corner-stone (of the west front of the intended building) consisted of a large and well-worked piece of masonry in ashlar stone from a quarry near Leeds. On a brass plate inserted was this inscription: "The



first stone of the new Unitarian Chapel, built on the site of the old Presbyterian Chapel, Blackwater Street, Rochdale, was laid on the 23rd day of April, in the year of our Lord, 1856, by George Holt, Esq., of Liverpool. Trustees, Joseph Wood, Richard Taylor Heape, Benjamin Heape, James Leach, Thos. Broadbent Wood, Chas. Heape, Joseph Wood, Jun., John Wood. Chairman of Building Committee, Joseph Wood, Esq. Minister, Rev. William Smith. Architect, Henry Bowman."

The stone having been lowered into its place and tested and found right, Mr. Holt stood upon it, and delivered with great animation and effect a short address. We were prevented by the crowd at this period from taking full notes, and can only give a very imperfect outline of his words. He said that the occasion of their assembling on that day and that particular spot was one of considerable importance. To lay a foundation-stone at all was a ceremony that led those who beheld it to inquire the object of the intended building. Having reference to future times and other persons, it was a ceremony that naturally excited consideration and reflection. It was in their heart to build a temple for the worship of the one true God. The erection of a place for public worship and for the diffusion of religion in any of its forms and under whatever creed, was a matter deserving of public attention, and ought to be always of deep interest to the people. The house to be erected on that spot was to take the place of one erected by the piety and zeal of their Presbyterian forefathers. A century and a half had brought great changes. It was desirable to adapt the form and outward appearance of their houses of prayer to the circumstances of the times in which it was their happiness to live. When the Nonconformists of Rochdale built a hundred and fifty years ago, their circumstances were widely different from those of their descendants of the present day. The fathers of Protestant Nonconformity were called upon to suffer many things in maintaining free thought and pure consciences. They lived in times when the law scarcely protected them and public opinion was against them. They were driven therefore into holes and corners. They adapted their religious buildings to the circumstances of their humble fortunes and the insecurity of their privileges. They were at war, too, with a Church which prided itself on the beauty of its

buildings and the imposing character of its ceremonies. In their natural and praiseworthy desire of simplicity, they perhaps ran into an unnecessary extreme of plainness and scantiness. Their places of worship assumed the outward appearance of barns. Time had wrought a change in this matter, and the descendants of these men were anxious to have houses of prayer more correspondent to the genius of the age. The members of that congregation designed, he was pleased to know, to build on that foundation on which he then stood an edifice not unworthy of their principles, and the elevation of which would be characterized by a simple elegance. What gave especial importance and interest to the work was, that it was to be the result entirely of free-will offerings, the voluntary contributions of the members of the congregation and their friends, not raised by an extorted impost from men who took no share and felt no interest in the work. He said, with the apostle, Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He, for one, never felt disposed to find fault with any man who differed from him in opinion. He had known good men and sincere Christians in many different sects and classes. If sectarianism did not distil its bitterness into the heart, the spirit of Christ might prevail with equal power in every different sect and party. He congratulated his friends in Rochdale on the happy omens which attended the good work they had begun. It was not without very pleasurable emotions that he appeared that day in his native town, which as a boy he quitted rather less than fifty years ago. It was most gratifying to him to be called upon to perform the honourable office which the kindness of the members of that congregation had devolved upon him, and he sincerely thanked them for the distinction. He hoped and believed that the house they had begun to build would be a house of God. It was his earnest wish that the spirit of godliness might flourish there. He was far less anxious for the success of any peculiar set of opinions amongst them, than he was that Christianity might be ever preached in those walls and illustrated in the lives of successive worshippers. He begged them to bear always in mind the object which, as Christians, they ought to aim at in every work they undertook. Other foundation can no man lay than is laid by the doctrine; the life and the example of the divine

Founder of Christianity, who enjoined his disciples to love one another, and who also said, "If a man love me, he will keep my words, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode in him."—Mr. Holt was greeted at the close of his address with applause.

Rev. William Smith then mounted on the stone, and said that the occasion justified him, the minister of the old chapel, and, if God spared his life, in all probability of the new chapel, in saying a few words explanatory of their position as a religious society, holding views of God and Christ widely differing from those taught by authority, oftentimes, he was sorry to think, accepted with unreasoning acquiescence, and sometimes attempted to be propagated with a zeal more akin to the bitterness of superstition, than consistent with knowledge, truth and charity. Mr. Holt had well anticipated some things he intended to say. He trusted to their sympathy and forbearance to excuse any repetition or shortcoming. In the erection of this house of prayer and praise, they did not propose to perpetuate a mere set of opinions; they would not place any confidence in mere machinery for working out spiritual aims and ends. Institutions even of the best construction, the most cunningly-devised systems, were but bodies, and the body without the animating spirit is dead. It was a principle rather than a profession to which they desired to give there a local habitation, a living expression and a durable fame. They owed the site on which they were building to Presbyterian ancestors, whose proud distinction it was to have set the example of leaving posterity at liberty to form its own religious conclusions, by leaving the tenure of their foundations for the most part unaffected by special provision for the profession or maintenance of particular modes of thought or forms of faith. It would therefore ill become them, as their representatives, to renew in a narrow spirit that which their zeal first raised on that spot. They would thus belie their profession as Christians pledged to desire the truth alone, to pursue it with a single eye, to encourage the pursuit in simplicity of spirit, to judge by the patient exercise of their own powers what is right, and to be fully persuaded in their own minds. They would forfeit their claim to be regarded as sons of the prophets, true successors of those who, nearly two centuries since,

cheerfully surrendered their position in the then national Church, their prospects of preferment, house and home, all that is most to be prized in a worldly point of view, that they might worship God according to the dictates of conscience. No; this new chapel, like that which preceded it, would be dedicated to the use of a body of Christian believers who account the duty of free inquiry and the right of private judgment in the concerns between man's soul and the eternal Witness and Judge thereof, as of supremely more importance to the interests of pure religion, the extension of Christ's kingdom, the advancement of God's glory, and the progress of mankind in true holiness, than all the creeds, catechisms, articles or formularies, designed to enforce uniformity of faith, and to forestall the conclusions of a man's own mind. Not that he meant to imply that they were without distinctive views. They had convictions, and very distinct ones too, opinions which they were neither ashamed to confess nor afraid to avow, which separated them, as professors of the doctrine according to godliness, from the great mass of the Christian church. In obedience to the obligation to search the Scriptures independently of all human interpretation of their contents, and in the exercise of the right of private determination as to the truths they contained, they had been led to those results known as Unitarian Christianity. That principle, the principle of unbiassed thought, led their ancestors to protest against human interference in matters of religion; that principle of unshackled judgment constrained them to testify against any attempt on the part of human authority to exercise lordship over the domain of the individual heart and conscience. As worshippers of God, as disciples of Christ, as those who sit in the seat of the early Nonconformists, as believers in the truth as it is in Jesus Christ, as Protestant Dissenters, they were engaged in that act of founding a new edifice for religious worship and Christian instruction. In the holy volume they thought they possessed the vehicle of revealed truth, and in the New Testament especially they believed that they had the word of eternal life; in the constitution and capacities of their own nature, they supposed themselves to enjoy the powers of perception and judgment sufficient to determine what the Scriptures reveal for our instruction in righteousness; and

in the new temple which they had begun to raise, they hoped to re-establish an effectual means, not only of carrying forward their own Christian culture, but also of contributing to the Christian development of the generations to succeed them in the house of prayer and praise shortly to occupy that space,—a space hallowed by the memory of those who in the bygone past, from week to week and from year to year, had been wont to assemble there, to confirm faith, to sustain hope, to quicken affection, and to teach desire, will, endeavour, every power and every passion, every principle that can stir this mortal frame, to grow continually in the likeness of God as manifested to men in the face of Jesus Christ.

Mr. Smith then offered a brief and solemn prayer, and dismissed the assembly with the apostolic benediction.

From the site of the new chapel, a large proportion of the company adjourned to the Temperance Hall, St. Mary's Gate, where tea had been provided in celebration of the event. The room proved insufficient for the accommodation of the numerous assemblage; (about 300), and they partook of the refreshing meal in two sets, the second relay waiting their turn in the spacious lobby which forms the approach to the Hall. After the tables had been cleared, the proceedings of the evening commenced by the appointment to the Chair of Joseph Wood, Esq., of the Butts, who, when he had acknowledged the honour conferred upon him and expressed his gratification in presiding over so numerous a gathering, hoped that his friends around would hail with acclamation the name of our Sovereign Lady, the Queen, and join him in wishing her long life and a prosperous reign. Mr. W. pointed out that the day was doubly memorable, since it had not only served the Blackwater-Street Unitarian congregation to commence a most important enterprize, but had also been employed by our gracious Sovereign in reviewing one of the most imposing exhibitions of physical power which the world had ever witnessed; and he felt well assured that he was only uttering the sentiments of all present when he said that he trusted the day was not far distant when every display of material might would be regarded as secondary to that moral force by which alone it was desirable that the world should be ruled.—The choir and

company then sang "God save the Queen," standing.

The Chairman next expressed his grateful sense of the excellent and ample provision which the Ladies had made for the comfort and enjoyment of the evening, and begged to return them his hearty thanks for the care and forethought which they had evinced in their preparations for the occasion.—Mr. Charles Heape responded in suitable terms on the part of the ladies, and declared it to be his conviction that the acknowledgement of the ladies' services was the event of the evening.

Mr. Wright, who was called upon to answer to "The means for the revival and advancement of Genuine Christianity," considered that the Unitarians of Rochdale, in the work which they had that day so auspiciously commenced, had proved themselves alive to a very important agency in "the revival and advancement of genuine Christianity."

The President now took the opportunity of acknowledging the munificent aid afforded to the Blackwater undertaking by the Unitarians of Bury.

To this John Grundy, Esq., of Summerseat, replied by stating that the people of Silver-Street chapel wished only to be distinguished by their zeal, activity and success in promoting Unitarian objects and views, and that it was not more a pleasure to them to help themselves, than a satisfaction and a duty to help their weaker brethren.

Mr. Wood tendered the "best thanks of the meeting to George Holt, Esq., for his visit and services, and hoped that the Liverpool Unitarians might long continue to send forth so worthy a representative of the common faith."

Mr. Holt thought that, in place of being thanked, he ought to thank his friends at Rochdale for the privilege they had accorded him; for he could not help thinking himself highly favoured in being permitted to take so conspicuous a part in the interesting proceedings of the day. He felt, he could assure those who heard him, an unspeakable satisfaction in the position which he occupied, and he could sincerely congratulate his fellow-believers and townsmen on the good work which they had deputed him to begin, by acting that day as master mason in laying the foundation of a new chapel. He must, however, be permitted to remind them that "other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ," and that "a wise master-



builder will take heed" that all material means shall contribute to moral ends. Mr. H. craved the indulgence of the meeting if he seemed to his hearers somewhat at a loss to express the thoughts and emotions which crowded upon him, as he stood there, a native of the town, for the first time, after a forty-nine years' absence, taking part in any public transaction connected with the place of his birth. Nevertheless, amidst many and diverse memories crossing his mind, he should retain this pleasing reminiscence, that his first public appearance in his native town was associated with a public benefit,—the re-establishment, in renovated beauty, of a building dedicated to the diffusion of free thought and the celebration of free worship. Whilst he witnessed, since the period of his boyhood, in the habits, manners, speech and apparel of the neighbourhood in which he had spent his earliest years, a change for the better, which he could not describe in words, he was not less delighted to observe a corresponding change taking place in the edifices from which those influences should emanate best calculated to mould the character in all that is "true, lovely, and of good report."

Mr. Taplin, in noticing the sentiment of "The Christian Religion, free from the assumptions of Priestcraft, the usurpations of Churches, and the intolerance of Sects," enlarged upon the impossibility of effecting this result otherwise than by developing the spiritual side of human nature.

Mr. Cropper directed his remarks to the subject of "Unitarian Christianity as the nursery of Truth and the parent of Freedom," and, after sundry sly allusions to the blessed singularity which is the nursery of nothing great and worthy, urged upon his audience the necessity of attention to the training of their young. Upon mothers especially he enforced this obligation; and he could commend to them no more efficient discipline, as the ally of Truth and Freedom, than that afforded by Unitarian Christianity, which was in striking contrast in this respect to all other forms of Christianity. Whether, he would ask mothers, would they prefer a theology which represented "babes and sucklings" as born in sin, the children of wrath, and (unless rescued by an act of divine grace akin to the miraculous) under God's everlasting damnation, or one which pictured their offspring as such as the kingdom

of heaven consists of, God's good gift committed to them in unsullied innocence, in order that they may cherish it until it blooms in a holiness fitted for the realms of immortal blessedness? Unitarian theology was the treasury of this last most precious conviction. Whether, he would ask the husbands in that assembly, would they range themselves under the banners of a system which devoted them to eternal separation from the partners of their joys and woes on earth, if they happened to differ upon speculative points of belief, or under the standard of one which taught them to aspire after and to expect an eternal re-union in a heavenly Father's mansions, after their earthly course had been completed in the fellowship of well-doing? Unitarian Christianity provided for them this last inexpressibly sweet persuasion.

In speaking to "Our Presbyterian Ancestors," Mr. Baker embraced the opportunity of explaining what was meant by that phrase. He gave a rapid and succinct historical sketch of our spiritual forefathers, shewed how faithful they were to the principle of free inquiry and private judgment, and trusted that those who were their modern representatives, through their care to preserve this principle intact, would prove not less faithful, in their altered position and sphere, than the early Nonconformists.

"Our Chapels and their Worship;—to the young, may they supply instruction in righteousness; to the mature, may they be a bond of union; to the aged, may they prove a source of hope." To this, in a speech of great pertinency and effect, Mr. C. W. Robberds replied.

Mr. Hoade followed with some appropriate observations on "Popular Education, and the necessity for its universal diffusion."

Mr. Smith, in the name of his congregation, then thanked the brethren of Clover-Street chapel for the accommodation which they had tendered them during the interval which must elapse before their own place of worship is rebuilt, coupling with the expression of his thanks his fervent wish for the speedy restoration of Mr. Wilkinson to that sphere of usefulness which he has long adorned, and from which indisposition at present separated him.

After acknowledging the services of the choir, and thanking the Chairman for his efficient performance of the duties of his office, the meeting concluded by singing the Evening Hymn,

and all dispersed to their homes highly gratified with the day's proceedings.

We close our narrative of this meeting with a brief architectural account of the intended edifice.

It is designed in the Pointed or Gothic style, of the variety which prevailed in this country about the middle of the 13th century, when the Early English was fully developed, and was about to merge into the Decorated style.

It will be seen that the plan of the building is very simple, consisting of a nave and south aisle, under separate roofs; that of the nave being terminated at each end by a gable, with a small bell canopy and metal cross on the apex of the west, and a stone ornamental cross on that of the east gable. The length of the building externally is 66 feet, and the width 34 feet.

The principal entrance is at the west end, and over it is a large four-light window, with tracery in the head. The east end has also a four-light window with tracery, but differing in design from that at the west end. On the north side are four windows, the most westerly being of three lights, and the others of two lights. The south windows of the aisle correspond in width and number of lights to those on the north side, except in the eastern bay, which contains the minister's private door to the vestry, and a couplet of small trefoil-headed windows. The east and west ends of the aisle have also two light windows. All the windows have the heads filled with simple geometric tracery.

Externally, decoration is but sparingly used, being confined chiefly to the entrance doorway and the large window over it, the former having a richly moulded arch of the ordinary pointed character; the aperture of the doorway, however, being formed with a trefoiled head. All the windows stand on a moulded string-course. The set-offs of the buttresses are mostly of the simplest form, but on the main buttresses to the nave the upper weatherings are enriched with a trefoiled canopy and finial.

Internally, the nave is divided from the aisle by four clustered columns and moulded arches of Bath stone, and over these a low clerestory, with a small window over each arch, formed alternately as a quatrefoil and a trefoil. The eastern bay is raised one step and set apart as a chancel, to contain the singers' seats and the communion-table,

which latter stands on a platform, one step above the chancel floor. The adjoining bay of the aisle is enclosed by a carved oak screen, the eastern portion being used as a vestry, and the remainder to contain the organ. On the north and east sides the internal jambs and arched heads of the windows are enriched with mouldings, shafts, capitals and bases. Those on the west and south sides have simple moulded splays. Under the north, east and west windows runs a moulded string-course, similar to that outside. The roof is entirely open to the interior, all the timbers being wrought and stained. Over each pillar and against the east wall is a main principal, and between these are subordinate principals. All have cross struts and curved braces, forming a complete pointed arch. The main principals rest on moulded stone corbels. The principals of the aisle roof are also supported on stone corbels, and are strengthened by curved struts, resting against the wall over the columns. The seats are to be open, with moulded standards and backs, those in the chancel being of a somewhat more ornamental character than the others. The pulpit is intended to stand against the north wall, at the point of junction between the nave and chancel.

#### OPENING OF THE NEW UNITARIAN CHURCH, GLASGOW.

This elegant new church is situated in St. Vincent Street, upon an elevated and commanding site, entirely free from surrounding buildings. It is in the Greek style of architecture, after designs by Mr. J. T. Rothead, of Glasgow. The building is a parallelogram in plan, about 100 feet long by 50 feet wide, with a noble hexastyle portico, after the example of Hadrian's Aqueduct at Athens.

The sides and ends are adorned with pilasters, with rusticated polished ashlar work between, to the extent of two-thirds the height of the walls, the remaining height being of plain ashlar. Between the pilasters are deep-set panels, for the purpose of still farther relieving the walls. There are no side windows, the building being lighted entirely from a cupola conformed to the lines of the roof. In the back elevation, where light is needed for the vestry and adjacent rooms, it is obtained by filling in panels answering to the stone ones upon the side walls, with

entire sheets of ground plate-glass fixed in the stone-work. The columns and pilasters are surmounted by a massive entablature, which is carried along the sides and round the ends; and as the portico is the full width of the building, the Greek style is represented with remarkable purity. The entrance is approached by a flight of steps within the portico on either side.

The interior harmonizes with the exterior, and is admirably adapted for the purposes of Christian worship. The absence of galleries and side windows adds greatly to the general effect. The pulpit occupies part of the apse at the end of the chapel, and has pilasters on either side. The whole terminating apse behind the pulpit and above the vestry is occupied by a commodious organ gallery, the organ having a case, with pillars and cornice, in the style of a small temple, and harmonizing with the rest of the building. The side walls are relieved by channelled jointed work, with a rich terminal cornice. Brackets of elegant design project from this cornice, supporting draped female figures, from whose outstretched arms globes of light are suspended. These figures, designed for the church by Mr. Messman, a sculptor of rising eminence, have a beautiful and pure devotional cast of form and feature, and embody with success the sweet and gentle aspects of the Christian's faith. The cupola, from which the light flows abundantly and pleasantly into the building, is 35 feet long by 15 feet broad. The ceiling is set off into square compartments and deeply-recessed coffers. The estimated accommodation is for 600; but instead of pews, there are seats with open backs. A commodious vestry, school-room, and two small class-rooms, are provided.

The whole design is a most successful adaptation of Greek art to Christian worship. The organ has been almost entirely rebuilt by Messrs. Herrington and Co., of London, the gainers of the first prize at the Paris Exhibition.

The church was opened for public worship upon April 13th. The Rev. James Martineau conducted the morning service. The text of his discourse was Acts xvii. 27, and the preacher endeavoured to lead his hearers to the recognition of the Great Spirit ever seeking out his children, and, through the world without and the soul within, eternally manifesting his infinite life. The doctrine urged was distinguished from Pantheism. Though God is within

nature, nature is no measure of God. While to the Pantheist nature exhausts God, to the Theist behind and beyond nature dwells the Everlasting. Thus was the language of devotion concerning Him in whom we live and move and have our being, vindicated from philosophical objection.

In the afternoon, the Rev. Henry W. Crosskey, the minister of the congregation, officiated. He took for his text Ps. xlii. 1, 2, and pointed out the mode in which men are brought to God by nature, the human heart, Christ and the prophets, and every experience of life,—dedicating the house of prayer to the worship of the one living God, in the name of a Christian faith harmonizing with reason, love and conscience, and inspiring to the full individual and social development of humanity.

In the evening, the Rev. James Martineau again preached, touching upon questions relating to the existence and punishment of sin, and protesting against the popular confusion of innocence and guilt in the vicarious scheme of salvation.

The services of the day were attended by full congregations; admission in the morning, indeed, had to be limited by tickets. In the course of the day, the managing committee and trustees entertained Mr. Martineau and the strangers to dinner. Mr. Martineau's services were warmly acknowledged, and, in reply, he expressed his deep sympathy with the congregation and its minister, and from his own personal observation stated his conviction that the Glasgow congregation should be fully endorsed by the Unitarian body, as forming one of its most promising churches. The collection made at the doors amounted to £92.

Upon April 20th, services were conducted by the Rev. Charles Clarke, of Birmingham. Mr. Clarke's discourses pointed out the relations sustained by the Bible and the Church to the soul of man, and illustrated the relation of Christ to the church, and the work of Christ, as the loftiest ideal of excellence, in regenerating the heart.

In the afternoon, Mr. Crosskey assembled the children connected with the congregation, and endeavoured to bring home to their hearts, in simple language, the purposes for which the new church was built.

Upon Tuesday evening, April 22nd, a *soirée* was held, at which the speeches were of an unusually able and interesting character; but we are unable



to find room for even an abridged report.

Upon Sunday, April 27th, this interesting series of services was brought to a close by the Rev. George Harris, of Newcastle. In the morning, the preacher took for his subject the Fatherhood of God, and pointed out how this great doctrine gives nature a new aspect, life a new interest, and immortality a new glory. In the evening, he described the nature of Christian salvation as a change of heart and life, and contended that the great work and worth of Christianity is its power to fashion character. In this aspect Christianity is destined to pervade all things. There will be Christian trade—when cheating and chicanery will cease. There will be Christian science—not that the views of Moses and Joshua will be adopted in preference to what God has written upon the rocks and stars, but that science will minister to worship. The church will be christianized, giving up its bigotry and creeds, and enthroning freedom, intelligence and humanity.

Throughout, the congregations have fully equalled the capacity of the church; and the genial and devout, comprehensive and catholic, character of the various introductory services, has laid an admirable foundation for the work now so well begun by the Unitarians of Glasgow.

BOLTON DISTRICT UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

The spring meeting of the Bolton District Unitarian Association was held at Cockey Moor, a hamlet in the township of Ainsworth, four miles from Bolton, on Thursday, the 1st of May. There was a large gathering of friends from almost every part of the district. The service was introduced by a hymn, and the devotional exercises were conducted by the Rev. J. S. Gilbert, of Rivington. The sermon was preached by the Rev. W. Probert, of Walmsley, who took his text from 2 Timothy iii. 17. All the services were highly satisfactory, and received an expression of deserved admiration at the subsequent meeting.

Tea was provided in the school-room contiguous to the chapel burial-ground. About 250 ladies and gentlemen were present. The Rev. John Wright, of Bury, was requested by Mr. Whitehead to preside, in consequence of his own indisposition.

The Chairman was assisted by all the ministers present, viz., Revds. John Ragland, William Probert, T. E. Poynting, J. S. Gilbert, W. Smith, M. C. Frankland and others, in bringing before the numerous company assembled on the occasion a variety of sentiments framed so as to embrace many of those topics which interest Dissenters at the present time, and which are in harmony with the objects of the meeting. Several of the speeches displayed great power and eloquence, and were listened to with deep interest. Allusions were made to the zeal, generosity and activity of the Unitarians in the district, the fruits of which were seen in the new and beautiful chapels which were erected, or about to be erected, in Bury, Bolton and Rochdale. A Petition was agreed upon in favour of University Reform. It was numerously signed, and forwarded to Joseph Crook, Esq., M. P., for presentation to the House of Commons. At the close of the proceedings the sympathies of the meeting were offered to the respected minister of the place, and heartfelt wishes were expressed for his complete recovery. The Secretary announced that the autumn meeting of the Association would take place at Hindley, when the Rev. J. S. Gilbert would be the preacher.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

The thirty-first anniversary of this Association was celebrated at Little Portland-street chapel on Wednesday, May 14th. The Rev. G. Vance Smith introduced the service, and the sermon was preached by Rev. W. J. Odgers, of Bath. His text was 2 Cor. iv. 13, "It is written, I believed, and therefore have I spoken; we also believe, and therefore speak." The sermon was designed to present an affirmative and practical view of the Unitarian faith; to shew that it is not a mere system of negations, but includes those great principles of mental freedom and personal righteousness and love to God and man which constitute the essence of Christianity; that our position is not merely one of protest and denial; that we seek to remove error, because it hinders men from seeing and embracing the truth; yet that we not only doubt and reject, but also earnestly "believe, and therefore speak." The preacher further observed that all true religion includes three essential elements—the

rational, the philanthropic and the devotional; and endeavoured to shew that the Unitarian faith, wherever its genuine influence is fully manifested, will exhibit these three elements in activity and harmony. In conclusion, he referred to the ignorance, the scepticism and the superstition now so prevalent, — to the fact that the Unitarian faith has adequately met the spiritual wants of man, — and to the favourable “signs of the times,” as reasons for the honest profession and earnest advocacy of that faith, and for the generous support of all institutions which are adapted to promote its diffusion in the world.

The service was attended by a highly respectable audience, although the weather undoubtedly exercised an unfavourable influence upon their number. The collection amounted to £19.7s. 11d.

At the meeting for business which followed, the Rev. J. J. Tayler occupying the chair, the Rev. T. L. Marshall read the Committee’s Report. After a few introductory remarks respecting the pecuniary state of the Association, the proceedings of the Committee in reference to the British and Foreign School Society were described, and allusion was made to the meeting at Birmingham of the 30th October last. The efforts made in Parliament to open the advantages of the national Universities to all classes of Her Majesty’s subjects, were described at some length. Petitions on this subject, and also the Revision of the Authorized Version of the Holy Scriptures, were adopted. The proceedings of the year in connection with the New Version were then alluded to:—“In accordance with the fourth resolution of the last general meeting, your Committee have during the year given much consideration to the subject of the publication of a revised edition of the Old Testament. They have now to inform the members of the Association that the Rev. Chas. Wellbeloved has kindly consented, at the request of the Committee, to allow his Translations of the Pentateuch and Poetical Books to form a part of the proposed works, subject to such revision as he may himself deem expedient. The course to be taken in regard to the remaining books has received much anxious consideration, and, after communicating with several gentlemen who appeared best able from their attainments and position to give advice in such a matter, your Committee have seen reason to depart in some measure

from the plan proposed in the last Report. Instead of simply republishing any existing Translations, they have thought it decidedly the preferable plan to provide for the remaining books by a Revision of the Authorized English Version. What is meant by this is not, of course, the preparation of a new translation of such books, but rather the publication of the Authorized text itself, corrected wherever necessary, so as to make it faithfully represent, as far as possible, the existing state of learning in the departments of Old-Testament criticism and interpretation. The gentlemen in whose hands the work now is, and who will co-operate with each other in carrying out the plan just stated, are, in addition to Mr. Wellbeloved, the Rev. John Kenrick, Rev. G. Vance Smith, and Rev. J. Scott Porter. It is found desirable that the work should form three volumes, each of about the size and appearance of the Layman’s Version of the New Testament, by the late Mr. Edgar Taylor. It would be premature to attempt to enter into further particulars at present, and it need only be added that it is intended to publish each volume as soon as it is ready, and at such a price as will place it within easy reach of all classes of readers.”

In referring to the new field of missionary enterprise adopted by the American Unitarian Association, and the relations existing between the two Associations, the Committee had decided upon assisting in this object, by devoting the sum of £50 from the Calcutta Fund for each of two years towards the support of such missionaries. “In so doing, they cannot refrain from a reference to the cordial spirit which has characterized the communications of their American friends upon this subject. The aspect of political relations between the United States and this country has been considered by some as furnishing ground for apprehension that the friendship existing between these two great nations may be disturbed. Your Committee cannot concur in any serious apprehensions that we should ever be engaged in a conflict so unnatural, and fraught with such disastrous consequences to both countries. They conceive, however, that the present is a suitable opportunity for offering, on the part of the Association, to their brethren in America, the strongest assurances of sincere regard as co-religionists and fellow-men, connected by the closest ties of

descent, of language, of social interests, and of attachment to those principles of civil and religious liberty on which depend the welfare and progress of mankind."

The office of Home Agent and Missionary, which it will be recollected was proposed to be abolished about this time, is decided to be continued. The total sum expended in grants of money during the year amounted to £865.—The Committee insert a letter to them from the Rev. J. C. Woods, giving a cheering account of the Adelaide congregation.—The Book and Tract department has circulated in various ways 12,175 books and tracts, of the value of £227. 17s.

From the Treasurer's Report, read by Mr. Webb, it appeared that the income for the year, including a sum from the Trustees of the Cooke Fund, was £1264. 12s. 1d.

After the reception of the Reports, the attention of the meeting was occupied chiefly on two Petitions in reference to University Reform and a revision of the Authorized Version of the Scriptures,—Mr. Jas. Heywood, M.P., Mr. Yates, and the Revds. E. Tagart, J. Gordon, T. L. Marshall, G. Vance Smith and others, taking part in the discussion.

The company afterwards adjourned to a collation at the Music Hall, Store Street, at which Mr. James Yates presided with great efficiency. Besides those of the Chairman, very interesting addresses were delivered by Mr. James Heywood, Rev. E. Tagart, Rev. J. J. Tayler, Rev. John Gordon, Mr. W. P. Price, M.P., Rev. Dr. Beard, and the Hon. J. G. Palfrey, D.D. Our crowded space prevents our insertion of the merest outline of these, but we cannot forbear giving a few sentences of the striking and eloquent speech of the last-named gentleman.

"Two or three days ago I enjoyed the privilege—and I consider it a great one—of listening to my friend on my right hand (Rev. J. J. Tayler), and besides all that I enjoyed in his discourse, affecting as it was to my heart and instructive to my mind, I had yet another enjoyment before I left the chapel, in remembering that there, at the distance of time (thirty years) of which I now speak, I received the cordial grasp of that excellent lamented man, Mr. Belsham, in almost the last year of his life. I have made another acquaintance, Sir, to-day of a gentleman (Rev. T. L. Marshall) whom I knew in his boyhood at my own home in Boston

—the successor of one to whom I also owe the most grateful remembrance—Mr. Aspland, of Hackney. It has been readily said that we American Unitarians have the strictest, the closest sympathy with you of England. Our trials, Sir, were similar to yours; the course of our speculations have been closely resembling; our condition at this day is much the same. My friend (Mr. Tayler) spoke in a few words just before he sat down of the clouds that have been lately thought to hang over the friendly relations between your country and ours. Sir, what is a cloud? A cloud is a very thin, vapoury, unsubstantial, transient thing. The sun above the clouds is never absent from the sky—the genial sun of warm fraternal affections which is able to dispel and consume all the thin vapours that float above us. Sir, our literature is the same; not similar, but the same. We claim a share in the same heritage as you. Your ancient worthies before the time of the emigration, of which my friend has spoken, belonged to us as much as you. Our ancestors were the associates as well as the contemporaries of Chaucer, of Wycliffe, of Bacon, of Shakspeare; all of them belong to us as much as they belong to you; and when the time came for that divergence to which reference has been made, and our ancestors went to plant civil and religious liberty on one side of the water and you remained to plant the same growth here, it was the doing in different places the same work. My friend takes shame to himself that our people were sent away, because they were true to their convictions of right. Suppress that feeling, Sir. You would not have been among those who sent us away; you would have been one of the ejected ministers of that time. It is not for a circle of Unitarian Christians to consider themselves, as it were, imputed in the persecutions of the time; they of that age who are represented this day within this room were separate, though perhaps not in the same manner, as those to whom we owe our parentage, the difference being only, that while the one suffered on one side of the water, the others suffered on the other; and that is not a very great difference, for there is now only a ten days' passage between us. We have the same history, the same books, and our blood is the same. It is the temperament, the constitution, the Anglo-Saxon make of mind and body that Providence gives, that has wrought out these results. As one of our own poets has said, alluding to the possibility of any difference arising between us, there will



be a pacific influence in the current that flows in the veins of both of us alike. His words are—

‘From beach to distant beach,  
The voice of blood shall reach,  
More eloquent than speech :  
‘We’re one!’

Yes, Sir, there can be no final, no lasting difference between us. ‘We angry lovers mean not half we say.’”

#### SUNDAY-SCHOOL ASSOCIATION.

The twenty-second public breakfast and annual meeting of this Association was held at Radley's Hotel, Bridge Street, Blackfriars, on Thursday, May 15th. There was a numerous attendance, and most of the ministers from the country who had attended the Association meeting on Wednesday were present. The Rev. J. L. Short, on taking the chair, referred to the progress of general education during the last twenty years, and instanced the case of Bridport, where ten years ago only 1 in 12 of the population was educated, and at the present time it was proved that 1 in 6 was receiving a good education. During that period, 700 children had passed through their general schools. As the necessity for elementary instruction in Sunday-schools was thus being removed, their proper work, that of enlightening the conscience and bringing it into harmony with the spirit of Christ, could be more effectually promoted. Mr. Robert Green, the Treasurer, then read the report of the funds of the Association, which the Chairman declared was not altogether satisfactory, as a larger measure of support ought to be given to so valuable an institution. The Rev. W. Vidler then read the report of the Committee.

The report was of more than ordinary interest, containing other matter than the usual details; but our space will not permit us to give more than a brief summary. At the last annual meeting, the Committee were instructed to ascertain the number of teachers and scholars in our Sunday-schools who became members of our congregations. Great difficulty was experienced in procuring this information. Only a few returns have been received. From these it appeared that in many cases the teachers are members of the congregation, and in one instance most of the children as they grow up remain attendants at the services. It was found that where the congregation take but

little personal interest in the Sunday-school, however liberally they may subscribe to its support, those who are educated in the school do not remain in connection with the congregation.

The importance of sending deputations to the country had been repeatedly urged by many friends, a living representative being deemed more influential than any correspondence. Accordingly deputations were sent to attend meetings held at Manchester, Oldbury and Southampton. The reports of these deputations form a pleasing feature in the proceedings of the past year. The cordial reception met with on all sides, the healthy state of several of the schools visited, are dwelt upon with satisfaction; whilst some defects in the mode of instruction are pointed out in a kind and friendly spirit. In the hope expressed at the conclusion of one of these reports every one will be disposed to join,—“that the visits to schools and conversations with teachers may tend to draw closer the bonds of union and friendship which should ever be maintained between the Association and the various schools connected with the non-subscribing body throughout the country.” During the year, 9 schools have joined the Association and 4 schools have been discontinued. In 86 schools in connection with the Association, it appears from the returns sent to the Secretary, there are 11778 children and 1759 teachers. From 51 schools not in connection with the Association, returns have been received which shew there are 4164 children and 771 teachers. 16 schools made returns last year, but have omitted to do so this year; in these schools there were 1309 children and 191 teachers. If it be supposed that no alteration has taken place, and these numbers be added, the gross total of the 153 schools will be 17251 children and 2721 teachers, which is some increase on the summary of last year. The report states that the Committee had seen with regret the falling off in the circulation of the Sunday-School Magazine, which had entailed a loss of £30 in its publication, and had voted £5 towards defraying a portion of the debt. It gave them much pleasure to learn from the Rev. John Wright, that if sufficient support could be received to admit of the Magazine being conducted without great loss, it would not be discontinued. The report also mentions that small grants of books have been made to Trowbridge and Shepton Mallet; and

the Committee acknowledge, with thanks, the kind contributions in aid of the funds of the Association from Huddersfield and the Midland Counties Auxiliary Society.

The Rev. W. J. Odgers, of Bath, moved the adoption of the reports, and in the course of his remarks expressed a hope that a strong effort would be made to sustain the Magazine.—The resolution was seconded by Mr. John Green, of London, and passed unanimously.

The Rev. J. J. Tayler, Principal of Manchester New College, London, moved the next resolution—"That the main object of the Sunday-school should be the cultivation of the religious sentiment in the minds and hearts of the children of the poor, and trusts that the Sunday-School Association may be encouraged in its efforts to promote this most important work." He said he felt convinced that the Sunday-school was an essential and indispensable auxiliary to every Christian church. The great misfortune of many of our churches was, that they were isolated spheres of spiritual communion. After offering many valuable suggestions to those engaged in the great work of Sunday-school education, he concluded by directing attention to the efforts then being made by all classes for the elevation of the poorer members of society,—a circumstance which, he thought, should encourage all to persevere in works of Christian love.—The motion was seconded by Mr. John Fisher, of Dorchester, and carried unanimously.

The third resolution was moved by the Rev. W. A. Jones, of Taunton, seconded by the Rev. R. E. B. Maclellan, of Maidstone, and carried unanimously—"That this meeting desires to express its sense of the kindness experienced by the Rev. J. C. Means, Mr. J. C. Lawrence and Mr. H. J. Preston, as deputations from this Association to the Southern Unitarian Fund, the Manchester District Sunday-School Association, and the Midland Counties Unitarian Sunday-School Association, and hopes that the visits of those gentlemen may have been attended with results permanently beneficial to the Association."

The fourth resolution was moved by Mr. Charles L. Corkran, Domestic Missionary, of London, seconded by Rev. John Gordon, of Edinburgh, and carried unanimously—"That this meeting having heard with regret that a considerable diminution has taken place in

the circulation of the Sunday-School Magazine, takes this opportunity of expressing its high appreciation of the value of that publication, and of commending it to the friends of Sunday-school education."

The Rev. F. R. Young, of Newbury, moved the appointment of the Committee and other officers, which was seconded by the Rev. E. Talbot, of Tenterden.

The Rev. W. Vidler moved, and the Rev. J. C. Means seconded, a vote of thanks to the Chairman, which terminated the proceedings of a most interesting and satisfactory meeting.

#### LONDON DISTRICT UNITARIAN SOCIETY.

The sixth annual meeting of this Society was held at Radley's Hotel, Bridge Street, Blackfriars, on Thursday evening, May the 15th,—John Ashton Yates, Esq., in the chair. The attendance was larger than at any previous anniversary.

The Chairman, in commencing the proceedings, referred to a former period when the persecution of Dissenters was common. In the year 1793, his father was shot at; and for a long period he himself and others had been subjected to bitter taunts and reproaches. But that time had passed away. Unitarians were now respected—their numbers were increasing; and although perhaps those who avowed themselves Unitarians were not so numerous as could be desired, their principles were extending amongst men of other communions, and especially amongst the laity of the Church of England would liberality of religious sentiment be found to prevail. He was afraid that Unitarians were a little too aristocratic; they did not hold out the hand of Christian fellowship to the humbler classes as they ought to do. Room should be made for them in their chapels, and especially for those who could not afford the price of a sitting. He was almost disposed to think that benefit would result from the removal of the pews in several of the chapels. With regard to this Society, he thought that every one should be anxious to extend its means of usefulness, and he trusted it would receive from the Unitarians of London the support and co-operation to which it was justly entitled.

Mr. J. C. Lawrence, in the absence of Mr. Bicknell, who is on the continent, then read the Treasurer's report, from which it appeared that the receipts

during the year had been £147. 8s. 9d., and the expenditure, £154. 4s. 7d., leaving a balance against the Society of £6. 15s. 10d.

The Chairman next called upon Mr. J. T. Preston to read the report of the Committee, which gave a detailed account of the operations of the Society. We can only give a very brief summary. In addition to several courses of lectures delivered during the year in various parts of London, and the usual quarterly meetings of the members and friends of the Society, mention is made of an interesting correspondence with M. Riche Gardon, of Paris, the indefatigable editor of "*La Vie Humaine*." The progress of the Free Christian Church at Camden Town is alluded to, and satisfaction expressed at the formation of a Tract Society for distributing the tracts issued by that Church. The improvement of the congregations at Worship Street and Stamford Street is also noticed with pleasure, and the Committee have willingly aided in making public the lectures delivered at each of these chapels. Attention is directed to the excellent Theological Library formed at the rooms of the Society for the gratuitous circulation of works suited to religious inquirers.

The Rev. R. E. B. Maclellan, in moving the adoption of the report, said that no Society engaged his sympathies so fully as this Society, which was accomplishing a great work that could not be undertaken by the British and Foreign Unitarian Association. Its efforts had done away with the impression that there was a lack of zeal in the metropolis; and if similar efforts were made in the country, greater success would be met with in the spread of their principles than they had yet attained. He referred to the large proportion of the people who never entered a place of worship, and were connected with no religious association. If religion could be conveyed to them in a simple form, who could doubt the result? In the course of his remarks he alluded to the improved "Christian Unitarian tone" which had characterized the *Inquirer* newspaper under its present management.

The Rev. J. L. Short, in seconding the resolution, referred to the sympathy which the operations of the Society had called forth in the provinces. He regarded it as one of the most important missionary efforts in which Unitarians had ever been engaged. He believed its efforts would act not only

upon those on whom they were working, but also upon their own congregations.

The Rev. John Gordon moved the next resolution—"That this meeting, deeply impressed with the importance of the extension of the Christian religion, as the only effectual means of subduing sin and misery and bringing mankind into harmony with each other and with God, and convinced that the progress of Christianity is most materially impeded by unscriptural representations of the nature and character of the Deity, desires to commend the London District Unitarian Society to the earnest support of all who value the diffusion of religious truth in the spirit of charity." In the course of a powerful speech (of which we regret that our space will not permit us to give even a brief outline), Mr. Gordon said—The Chairman had asked, "Why Unitarianism did not make more progress? so many held their views, but did not unite in religious association with them." In his opinion, it was because they held Unitarian views without attaching much importance to them; because they would not make the sacrifices and the exertions necessary to carry out their convictions. Why they did not come forward, was not because they wanted opinions, but character. No one could tell how important any truth might become. Its importance had nothing to do with the question; that was a matter for God alone.

The Rev. F. R. Young, in seconding the motion, referred to the fact of Christianity being rejected by large numbers of the people, and gave an interesting account of the Secularists, their literature, and the different classes of which they were composed, and offered some important suggestions as to the best mode of reaching them and bringing them within Christian influences.

The Rev. Hugh Hutton moved, and Mr. R. W. Tayler seconded, the third resolution—"That this meeting desires to testify its respect for the memories of the late Mr. Alderman Lawrence, Mr. J. B. Estlin and Mr. R. Wright, and its sympathy with their families under their bereavement, and to express a hope that the interest manifested by those gentlemen in this Society will induce others to follow their example, and thus maintain and extend its influence."

The Rev. Henry Solly moved, and



Mr. H. J. Preston seconded, the fourth resolution—"That a Petition to the House of Commons in support of Mr. Heywood's motion for an address to Her Majesty to authorize a Revision of the Translation of the Bible, be adopted, and entrusted to James Heywood, Esq., for presentation."

Mr. S. C. Frankish moved, and Mr. J. T. Hart seconded, a resolution appointing the President and Vice-Presidents.

The Rev. T. L. Marshall moved, and Mr. John Warren seconded, a vote of thanks to the Treasurer and Secretaries, with a request that they continue their labours during the ensuing year.

Mr. Charles Steer moved, and Mr. Frederick Lawrence seconded, the appointment of Committee and Auditors.

Mr. J. E. Clennell moved, and Mr. J. T. Preston seconded, a vote of thanks to the Chairman, with which the proceedings terminated. Most of those present, previously to leaving, attached their names to the Petition for a Revision of the Translation of the Bible.

#### OCTAGON CHAPEL, NORWICH.

The centenary of the opening of the Octagon chapel, Norwich, by Dr. John Taylor, on the 12th of May, 1756, was celebrated, according to previous announcement, on the 11th and 12th of last month.

The honoured names which are familiarly associated with the history of the Octagon congregation during the past century, and several of which are so numerously represented, are in themselves sufficient to attach more than common interest to the occasion. That interest was widely shared, as the subjoined list of some of those present sufficiently shews. The Rev. T. Madge, of London; the Rev. James Martineau, of Liverpool; the Rev. T. Davis, of Evesham; the Rev. E. Tagart, of London; the Rev. J. Murch, of Bath; the Rev. J. J. Tayler, Principal of Manchester New College, London; the Rev. J. H. Hutton, of Manchester; the Rev. C. J. Robberds, of Oldham; the Rev. S. F. Macdonald, of Diss; the Rev. H. Squire, of Yarmouth; Sir T. B. Beevor, Bart.; John Taylor, Esq., F.R.S., of London; S. Taylor, Esq., of Gloucester; Philip Taylor, Esq., of Marseilles; Richard Taylor, Esq., of London; John Taylor, Jun., Esq.; Ed. Rigby, Esq., M.D., of London; Philip Worsley, Esq., of London; P. M. Taylor, Esq., of Dublin; T. L. Taylor, Esq., of Starston;

Mrs. J. Austin, of London; Mrs. Reeve, of London; Edward Taylor, Esq., Gresham Professor; Miss Taylor, of Diss; Peter Martineau, Esq., of London; Richard Martineau, Esq., of London; Philip Martineau, Esq., of London; David Martineau, Jun., Esq., and Mrs. Martineau, of London; Mrs. John Martineau, of London; the Misses Martineau, of Stockwell; C. Jecks, Esq., of Thorpe; E. U. Dowson, Esq., of Geldeston; H. Dowson, Jun., Esq., of Geldeston; Septimus Dowson, Esq.; J. W. Dowson, Esq.; A. Wills, Esq., and Mrs. Wills, of London; A. Lupton, Esq., and Mrs. Lupton, of Leeds; — Greenough, Esq., and Mrs. Greenough, of Newcastle-on-Tyne; Mr. and Mrs. Cooper, of Maidstone; Mrs. Lewis, of East Farleigh, Kent; Miss Cooper, of Hampstead; Mr. and Mrs. Alfred Higginson, of Liverpool, &c. &c.

The deeper and more solemn interest connected with an event so memorable in our religious history, blending with the renewal of personal recollections and family associations, and favoured by a happy interval of bright and genial spring weather, combined to make the réunion truly delightful.

The religious services on Sunday were conducted in the morning by the Rev. Edward Tagart and the Rev. T. Madge; in the evening, by the Rev. J. H. Hutton and the Rev. Jas. Martineau. The chapel was well filled in every part, and it is sufficient to say that the expectations raised by the names announced must in every respect have been more than fulfilled. It has rarely been our privilege to join a congregation of such absorbed and delighted listeners; and when, after the morning sermon, more than eight hundred hearts and voices united in singing to the Old Hundredth, Pierpont's beautiful hymn—

"O Thou to whom, in ancient time,

The lyre of Hebrew bards was sung,"—the impression produced was such as none present can well forget. It was striking indeed to see and to feel that three generations were uniting in that sublime and trustful song of grateful devotion. The words,

"To Thee shall age with snowy hair,  
And strength and beauty, bend the knee,  
And childhood lisp, with reverent air,  
Its praises and its prayers to Thee,"—

seemed then to be fulfilled; and could the spirit of the wise and good man who first led the devotions of that house of prayer have looked down upon

the successive generations of his own descendants thus happily gathered together, he would have felt with more than human power "the value of a child."

Of the sermons preached in the morning by the Rev. T. Madge, in the evening by the Rev. J. Martineau, it is impossible to speak too highly; and we record what we believe to have been the general impression when we say, that never was either preacher heard to more advantage. The following is an imperfect abstract of Mr. Madge's discourse:

1 Cor. iii. 11: "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ."

Upon the principle here expressed, those who built this place formed themselves into a Christian church. That they and their children might maintain it, they erected this spacious and beautiful building. Says Dr. John Taylor, "We are a society built and established, not upon any human foundation, but only upon the foundation of the prophets and apostles, of which Jesus Christ is the chief corner-stone;" and further on,—“As we allow no man to have dominion over our own faith, so we pretend to have no dominion over any man's faith or conscience, but freely leave him to the faithful exercise of his own judgment; nay, we advise and exhort every person to the free and sincere use of his own understanding and judgment, as the only way in which he can approve himself to God and gain the acceptance of his religious endeavours. And in this way, though he may not agree with us in disputable points, we own and receive him as acceptable to God and entitled to our religious fellowship."

These were the words which fell from the lips of that learned divine and faithful Christian who first preached in this place. The principles they express have since been consistently maintained by Bourne, Enfield and Houghton, as well as by his successors yet among the living.

How different sentiments can have prevailed in the churches of Christ may well excite our astonishment. It would seem as if the law of the Saviour were thought to be more honoured in the breach than the observance. For a long time there was no church in which the principle of the text was consistently acted upon. The preacher quoted Calamy and Baxter to shew how incomplete was the work of the Reformation.

Another writer had declared toleration to be the grand work of the devil. Such was the spirit of the Presbyterians from the time of the first Charles till the Revolution. It was only in the beginning of the 18th century that juster views prevailed,—juster views of God and of the rights and duties of man. They then came to the conviction that conscience was a sacred enclosure, consecrated to the Most High. Hence the change in the practice of their churches. Christian membership was granted to all who acknowledged that Jesus was the Christ. All barriers round the table of the Lord were swept away. Open communion was established, and humanly-ordained tests abolished. This is one of the chief points in which they differed from others. To transmit it to their descendants was in the hearts of those to whom this chapel owes its existence. In the commemoration of this day, we commemorate the principles which our fathers held sacred. This it is which connects the men of the present with the men of the past (not the belief of all that they believed)—this is the homage we should render to their virtue and piety.

The preacher went on to protest energetically against the vain attempt to fashion the minds of men according to one uniform standard, shewing from history and observation the nullity of creeds to secure this end. Inquiring what are the conditions of Christian fellowship in the New Testament, he shewed by numerous quotations that in no one instance is a sharply-defined confession of faith recorded. To require more than the Lord himself and his apostles required is a gross violation of the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free.

A hundred years have elapsed since the first congregation of worshipers assembled under this roof. I believe our views of Christian doctrine are *mainly* the same as they were then. But whatever changes there may have been, have taken place in the exercise of that Christian freedom which we have inherited from our ancestors. Whether our assemblies be called Free Christian Churches, or have any more distinctive name, the largest liberty is conceded to all who are desirous of joining our communion.

To all this it may be answered, "Though you have no written creed, still you have certain points in common; do not these virtually amount to a creed?" In one sense they do, but not

in the common acceptation of the word. A creed may be said to consist of a number of propositions, laid down by those who have no authority, and partaking of the peculiarities of their framers.

There can be no union among Christians unless they have some views in which they take a common interest. There must be agreement respecting the Object of worship. As Rev. J. J. Tayler says in one of his published discourses: "No church can exist without a creed, expressed or implied. . . . Even those who protest most loudly and indignantly against creeds, in point of fact have and require one. . . . We observe that all religious societies decline in which the spiritual consciousness is indistinct and weak—when the preaching is confined to vague, superficial generalities, with nothing marked and definite to indicate earnest conviction." (*Christian Aspects, &c.*, p. 290.)

We must have more than the right of private judgment. Our meeting together implies some principles which we hold dear. What is that faith? Is it not what is called Unitarian? Many of us object to this name. But you cannot by objecting to the name get rid of the thing. Nor can you complain of it as inappropriate. All I ask for is to call things by their right names, not to bind those who come after. The title is at once correct, significant and honourable, and denotes the leading doctrine of revealed religion, placed by Moses and Christ at the head of the commandments.

I am not so wedded to a name as not to be ready to give it up, should it be shewn to stand in the way of that comprehensive Christian union which is so much to be wished. But it is expressive of the point in which all agree. Why should not all unite with us on this ground? Our worship is inclusive of all; it is exclusive of none. This cannot be said of Trinitarian worship. Our faith is the common faith of Christians.

We expect and are prepared to find among ourselves diversity on other points of the greatest importance. I welcome it as testimony to the catholic principles on which our church is established. I claim for Unitarian Christianity the glory of being the only form of Christianity in which all can be brought to worship together in harmony and peace. A distinguished Roman Catholic layman and a Church-of-England divine drew up a series of articles

in which all Christians are agreed. If I were asked for a summary of Unitarian Christianity, I could not do better than refer to the exposition of a Christian spirit there given. Most cheerfully do I join in the wish that all distinctive names be dropped, the moment the occasion for using them has passed away. Whether in this world a consummation so devoutly to be wished will be ever attained,—whether Christians will lay aside the peculiarities of individual belief for the sake of uniting in worship of the one common Father, and listening to the instructions of one common faith,—is too doubtful to be confidently anticipated.

Our duty is to draw away men's attention from the subtleties of a scholastic theology to those vital truths which concern all alike. This is our work, contemplated by our forefathers in the erection of this chapel.

It is not for us to indulge in the speculations of the understanding, but to enforce the truth which moves the heart, the things that belong to our everlasting peace, the hopes of the gospel—to imbue our minds with its spirit and its power, that in the world our words and actions may shew that we have been with Jesus. Opinion, however correct in itself, will avail little, unless it influences our aims, pursuits and characters.

After earnest exhortation to an observance of the practical duties of vital religion, the preacher went on. The faculty of reason is regarded as our highest distinction; but the question is, what have you done with this great talent? So in respect of free inquiry. Do you also think of the duty connected with the right, of human fallibility and personal responsibility? And again rising to a consideration of the cheering and glorious hopes which spring from our views of the Great Object of worship, he proceeded to shew that we must love Him with all our hearts, if He sent Jesus Christ to assure us of his readiness to forgive. Let us rejoice in a message so gracious, loving and merciful.

You will be told that these views are cold and cheerless. Is there nothing in the doctrine of God as our Father; of the grace and truth that came by Jesus Christ; of his resurrection from the dead?

How has it happened that they have been embraced by poets and philosophers and divines, such as Milton, Locke, Newton, Price, Priestley, Lardner, Lindsey, Channing and Ware? Who can say that their deep piety and love and lofty virtues could be the fruits of a faith that



neither elevates the life nor sanctifies the heart? They exemplify its truth, its purity, its accordance with the dictates of reason, the character of God, and the teachings of Jesus Christ.

It is in ourselves that the fault lies, if they fail to produce in us like fruits of righteousness and holiness. They must not only dwell in our heads, but descend into our hearts; not only be accepted by reason, but incorporated as it were with the very substance of our souls, and centred in our deepest affections. . . . Let us then glorify God in our bodies and our souls, which are His; so shall our part be done, our warfare accomplished; so that having run with faithfulness the Christian race, we may lean on our pilgrim's staff, and quietly await the salvation of the Lord.

And \* now, having brought this imperfect address to a close, I cannot sit down without adverting for a moment to the time when it was my pleasure and my duty to conduct the devotions and services of this place, and to speak to those who assembled here the things partaking of life and godliness, as presented in the gospel of Christ. From that period to the present, the years that have intervened are many, and the changes that have taken place great. I look around me, and see few of the faces which then cheered me by their presence; friends with whom it was my happiness to hold familiar and frequent converse, have most of them passed away from earth, where they shall be seen no more, but not without leaving us hope of meeting them in another world, to renew the intercourse which we delighted in here. Let this be our source of consolation and comfort amidst the many vicissitudes of life and occurrences of death. But in speaking on this subject, so many heart-touching memories are awakened in my mind, that I will not trust myself to make more than this brief allusion. And since it may not be my lot often, if ever, again to address you from this place, allow me to add my best wishes for your peace and prosperity as a Christian church. May you ever keep in mind the holy purposes for which this house of prayer was at first erected! May the ministrations of religion be blessed to your real and lasting welfare! And when these your earthly sabbaths are brought to an end, may you rise to the celebration of that pure, glo-

rious and eternal sabbath which remaineth for the people of God!

Of the evening discourse, by the Rev. James Martineau, we regret to be unable to give a report. The text was taken from Acts ii. 4—6. The marvellous scene recorded by the apostle was described as breaking the charm of the one sacred idiom, the Aramæan, which the rabbis spoke, and which was held by them to be the only language allowed in the intercourse between God and man. But God's holy spirit, free as the wind, is no respecter of tongues; and the great lesson taught by the record of the day of Pentecost is, *one gospel in many dialects*. There are dialects of thought as well as of speech, which may reconcile us to the prevailing differences between Christians. The preacher proceeded to shew that there are three types of natural mind, on which the spirit of Christ may fall, and utter the words of God in a language of its own. In the apostolic age they are represented by Matthew, Paul and John. In the past century they appear in the persons of Taylor, the "evangelical" school, and Wesley, and are destined in the coming age to contribute their several elements of truth towards the formation of the more catholic church of the future. We do not attempt an analysis of a sermon to which no analysis more brief than the sermon itself can do justice. It must suffice to say that it was eminently characterized by the wide grasp of thought, the profound insight, the large spiritual sympathies and the masterly treatment, by which the preacher is distinguished. We anticipate a speedy renewal of the delight and instruction we received from listening to this and the morning sermon, in the perusal of both in a printed form.

On the following day, Monday the 12th, an assembly of nearly two hundred met at dinner at the Royal Hotel, including all the ladies and gentlemen whose names are given above. The chair was taken by John Taylor, Esq., F.R.S.,—E. Taylor, Esq., Gresham Professor, E. Rigby, Esq., M.D., H. Bolingbroke, Esq., J. N. Mottram, Esq., and J. Mills, Esq., acting as Vice-Presidents.

The Chairman opened the proceedings with some apposite remarks on the progress of civil and religious liberty during the past century, and with heartfelt satisfaction proposed "The health of the Queen, Prince Albert, and the rest of the Royal Family."

The following gentlemen subsequently addressed the assembly on the subjects associated with their names:

\* This conclusion is taken from the *Norwich Mercury*.

The Rev. Henry Squire, of Yarmouth—"Civil and Religious Liberty all the world over."

The Rev. Edward Tagart—"The Memory of the Two Thousand."

By permission of the Chair, the Rev. T. Madge gave, "The Descendants of Dr. John Taylor," which was responded to by John Taylor, Jun., Esq., and Dr. E. Rigby.

The Rev. T. Madge and the Rev. J. Martineau responded to the grateful acknowledgment of their valuable services of the previous day, and acceded to the request that their discourses might be printed.

Professor Edward Taylor—"The Memory of the Benefactors of the Octagon Chapel."

"The Rev. David Davis, Minister of the Octagon Congregation."

Peter Martineau, Esq., and P. Taylor, Esq., of Marseilles—"Our French Protestant Brethren."

The Rev. J. J. Tayler—"Religion without bigotry, and Faith without subscription to human creeds and articles."

The Rev. J. Murch—"Prosperity to Manchester New College; may it train up for us and our successors learned, pious and able Ministers of the Gospel."

Horatio Bolingbroke, Esq., proposed the health of the Chairman, and hoped that an infant school, supplementary to the boys' and girls' schools connected with the congregation, would be founded as a permanent memorial of the Centenary celebration.

The Chairman responded, and after giving, "The Deacons of the Chapel," which was acknowledged by J. N. Mottram, Esq., closed the proceedings by proposing, "Our Irish Presbyterian Brethren, especially those among them who alike refuse to adopt or impose any human Creed or Confession of Faith," which was responded to by Philip Meadows Taylor, Esq., of Dublin.

The company then adjourned to tea at the Assembly-rooms, where a considerable party was already gathered together. The whole number exceeded 200.

After tea the chair was taken by the Rev. David Davis, and the meeting addressed by the Rev. J. H. Hutton, on the following sentiment—"May peace, prosperity, Christian truth and charity, abide in the Temple whose centenary of existence we this day commemorate;" by the Rev. Thomas Madge; the Rev. Charles Robberds, "Our Places of Worship, and the interest we should take in them;" by Richard Martineau, Esq., on the Education of the People; the Rev.

Ed. Tagart, on Foreign Missions; the Rev. Jas. Martineau, on the Home Mission; the Rev. J. J. Tayler, on the Christian Ministry; and by J. W. Dowson, Esq.

After the benediction pronounced by the Chairman, the meeting broke up.

The above brief record of the very interesting and delightful proceedings is sufficient, as they have been fully reported in our weekly contemporary and the local journals.

#### THE PARKS ON SUNDAY.

The Sabbatarianism of the Pharisees has found a most unnatural ally in the religious indifference of the Prime Minister. The bands are silenced in the Parks. All special out-door attractions are to cease again in London on Sunday afternoons, and those of the public-house to regain their monopoly. We cannot withhold a few words of indignant sorrow at once for the withdrawal of an innocent source of Sunday happiness from the cooped-up Londoners, and for the unblushing avowal of unprincipled expediency on the part of Lord Palmerston in yielding to the demands of narrow bigotry. The failure of Sir Joshua Walmsley's motion for opening the British Museum on Sunday, had been compensated by something better. Week by week Sir B. Hall had justified the Park bands to all objecting delegates and to the newspaper-reading public, by the somewhat exulting declaration that the experiment was altogether successful, since multitudes approaching to a quarter of a million altogether (nearly one-tenth of the population of London) shewed their appreciation of the indulgence by their presence, and not less by their orderly behaviour. Almost ostentatiously it was announced that this musical indulgence was to be henceforth extended to the Victoria Park also; when, after one solitary Sunday's experience of its advantages there, the Government announce that, in deference to "public opinion" as expressed against the practice, while they retain their own expressed opinion in its favour, the music in all the Parks on Sundays will be discontinued.

Most strangely is this announcement accompanied with the allegation, on the part of Lord Palmerston, that the *working classes* have not shewn any great appreciation of the indulgence. As if a quarter of a million "working people" would have deserved consideration, but as many shopkeepers and clerks and such people do not!

Lord Palmerston alleges as his reason for this sudden reversal of the plan, a letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury and other signs of "public opinion."

What is public opinion? How is it intelligibly expressed? Does not Lord Palmerston read it in the conduct of the thousands who gratefully accepted the boon? Are their unorganized suffrages, as expressed in action, less intelligible or less valuable than the machine-made petitions of Exeter Hall and its branches? What public opinion has been expressed in London so numerous or so emphatically as that of the persons most nearly concerned, the orderly frequenters of the Parks?

Does Lord Palmerston consult public opinion out of London, in order to learn how Sunday should be spent in London? Has he no word of rebuke for the impertinence of those who, living in little country towns and hamlets, and having fresh air in their very dwellings all the week, and fields within a few hundred yards for their Sunday walk, presume to restrict the Londoner's Sabbath-day journey to a walk along the Strand or Fleet Street or Whitechapel? Does Lord Palmerston condescend to take counsel with the *Leeds Mercury*? Or does he learn the state of public opinion from Scotch Members of Parliament, who gravely inform him that they cannot conscientiously, or that their constituents will not allow them to, vote for any of his measures, however right, unless he stops the Sunday music in the Parks?

Everybody believes that the last is the real solution of the matter. So incredible are all other solutions for their irrationality, that this must be admitted in all its ignominy! And politicians palliate its meanness as a matter of statesmanship!

We grieve for such an exhibition of low public morality. Our Government ought not to reflect thus immediately each passionate expression of the popular will. The besetting vice of republicanism should not be thus courted by British statesmen.

On this Sabbath question the English Government have repeatedly obeyed or invoked mob-law, first in one direction, then in the other. Weakly and unworthily they closed the Post-office on Sundays in deference to "public opinion," knowing all the time that public opinion had not spoken. They tortured and trifled with public opinion till it was roused to indignation, and the Sunday delivery of letters was restored. Are they again testing public opinion by helping Pharisaism to make itself odious? Are they now soliciting the frequenters of the Parks to harangue and send clamorous petitions Sunday by Sunday? Is Lord Palmerston asking for working-men's demonstrations in favour of cheerful Sundays? Has he forgotten Lord Robert Grosvenor's Sunday mobs? It is a most unworthy course, — perhaps even dangerous.

No English statesman has so plainly avowed, as Lord Palmerston on these Sunday questions, that his convictions are in one direction and his conduct in the other. If the avowal is honest, the conduct is not so. What must we think of the liberalism that lends itself in avowed aid of bigotry? What is the use of enlightened opinion, if, while it asserts itself in theory, it retreats from action? It is the most grievous avowal of political insincerity. And "religious" people exult in its pliability to their purposes! To us it seems a sad dereliction of public virtue and of high statesmanship.

## MARRIAGES.

March 2, at the Unitarian church, Stockport, by Rev. James Bayley, Mr. SAMUEL SIDWAY to Miss EMMA FOWDEN.

March 2, at Christchurch chapel, Banbury, by Rev. J. M'Dowell, Mr. JOHN WM. PRESCOTT to Miss MARY EMMA HOBDAV.

March 12, at Cairo-Street chapel, Warrington, by Rev. P. P. Carpenter, EDWARD H. GREG, Esq., second son of Robert H. Greg, Esq., of Norcliffe Hall, Cheshire, to MARGARET, only daughter of the late William BROADBENT, Esq., of the Hollies, near Warrington.

March 19, at George's meeting, Colyton, by Rev. James Taplin, of Tavistock, the

Rev. D. L. EVANS, minister of the Colyton congregation, to Miss OPHELIA C. POWELL, daughter of the late Captain Powell, R.N.

April 21, at the parish church, Tideswell, Derbyshire, by Rev. A. A. Bagshawe, assisted by Rev. H. M. Mann, vicar, JAS. WORTHINGTON, Esq., of Altringham, to MARY, eldest daughter of Henry M'CONNEL, Esq., of Cressbrook.

May 14, at the New meeting-house, Birmingham, by Rev. Samuel Bache, ARTHUR WINKLER, youngest son of Wm. WILLS, Esq., of Edgbaston, to FANNY ELIZABETH, eldest daughter of Thomas PHILLIPS, Esq., of Edgbaston.



## OBITUARY.

April 19, at the house of his son-in-law, Rowland Hurst, Esq., postmaster, Wakefield, the Rev. THOMAS JOHNSTONE, in his 88th year.

The following notice is revised and made more complete from the Wakefield papers in which it first appeared.

This venerable man, whose death, at the advanced age of 87, is recorded in our columns this day, has seemed, through many years of green old age and gentlest decline, to be as it were a vital connecting link between the present generation and one that is now quite past. He could, in his personal experience, contrast many of our existing social blessings and interests with a very different state of things, and trace back to the public dangers and struggles of his own youth and early manhood the present general recognition of the great principles of civil and religious liberty. He had seen the principles of his young enthusiasm become the social facts of his mature life; political Reform won; Catholic Emancipation achieved; Dissenting disabilities expunged; Unitarian Christianity legalized, and its trusts secured.

Mr. Johnstone was born in November, 1768, at Stansted, in Essex. His father was a Dissenting minister among the Independents; and the son, having determined to devote himself to the same calling, was sent to the academy at Daventry, in Northamptonshire, after proper preparation under the Rev. Mr. Smith, an Independent minister at Bedford. His intimate friendship with Mr. Cogan, then assistant tutor at Daventry, was lately recorded in our memoir of the latter. (C. R., 1855, p. 240.) The theological tutor at Daventry at this time was the Rev. Thomas Belsham. This gentleman had succeeded Mr. Robins in 1781, about the time when Unitarianism was becoming "the controversy of the age" in connection with the writings of Dr. Priestley and the secession of Mr. Lindsey from the Church of England; and being himself a decided Trinitarian, Mr. Belsham was anxious to exhibit to his pupils the scriptural arguments for the Deity of Christ more systematically than had been the practice of his predecessors. But he has recorded that "the first consequence of this mode of conducting the lectures was to himself very unexpected, and not a little painful and mortifying. Many of his pupils, and of those some of the best talents, the closest application, and the

most serious dispositions, who had also been educated in all the habits and prepossessions of Trinitarian doctrine, to his great surprise became Unitarians. This, however, he was disposed to attribute to the fickleness of youth and to the caprice of fashion." (See Belsham's *Calm Inquiry*, Pref. p. vii, where the history and plan of this interesting course of study are detailed.) But in the course of a few years the teacher himself became a decided Unitarian too, and gave up his connection with the Daventry academy. He was invited in June, 1789, to become tutor of the Hackney New College, then recently established by the Presbyterians and Unitarians; and some of his old Daventry pupils followed him thither. Among these was Mr. Johnstone, whose religious views had become as decidedly Unitarian as Mr. Belsham's. After being a year at Hackney, he was invited to settle at Wakefield, as assistant to the Rev. Wm. Turner. This was in 1790; and he succeeded (on Mr. Turner's resignation in July, 1792) to the sole charge of the Westgate congregation.

In the same year in which Mr. Johnstone settled at Wakefield, his fellow-student, the now venerable Rev. Thomas D. Hincks, of Belfast, left the Hackney College to settle in Cork. Mr. Johnstone, being the elder student, was desired by Mr. Belsham to choose which of the two places he would visit as a probationer; and looking upon the west of Ireland almost as a foreign country, he preferred Yorkshire as less dreadfully remote (though in those days very distant practically) from his "kin and kind." In old age he would often recur to this decision as having been the turning-point of his lot, and would quietly muse on the wonderful ways of Providence which manifest themselves through such crises of our life. "So," he would say, "my lot was cast here ever since; and Mr. H. went to Cork, and has been in Ireland ever since."

Within a few years of his settlement at Wakefield, Mr. Johnstone married Martha, one of the daughters of John Milnes, Esq., of Flockton Hall, by whom he had a large family; but, as the stern condition of his own longevity, he has followed more than half his children to the grave. One son and three married daughters survive; and great-grandchildren, baptised by his administration, have climbed his venerable knees. In 1823, Mrs. Johnstone died, and Mr. Johnstone remained a wi-

dower till 1831, when he married Miss Elizabeth Lumb, who died in 1844.

In the spring of 1833, Mr. Johnstone resigned his charge of the Westgate congregation, after a ministry of nearly forty-three years; and he has, since that time, lived a life of quiet social usefulness and equable happiness, not declining (until the infirmities of age began to press) to take his share in the public events to which he always brought the energy and faithfulness of a Christian man.

In his early and middle life, as already hinted, Mr. Johnstone took part in the great struggles of his time for civil and religious liberty. Dissent in those days was among the most decided symptoms of a leaning towards liberal politics; and to be a Dissenting minister was to be proclaimed a reformer, or to be suspected as a seditious person, according to the predilections of the observer. Mr. Johnstone was among the most earnest advocates of Parliamentary Reform when the very phrase was sedition in the ears of Government spies. He was at one time under no little apprehension of being added (with his friend Robert Bakewell, of this town) to the political culprits of the Pitt Administration, for his activity in promoting a petition on this subject; or, as he used pleasantly to phrase it, "he and his friend Bakewell had once a fair chance of seeing the inside of York Castle." Mr. Johnstone was always consistent in his advocacy of Liberal politics. He voted for Lord Fitzwilliam (the Lord Milton of that celebrated struggle) in the great election of 1806; he was prominent in the local efforts for carrying the Reform Bill in 1832; and active in the election of the friend of his life, Mr. Daniel Gaskell, as the first Member for Wakefield. But his character was always so gentle and his manners so conciliatory, that this known steadiness of principle never limited the circle of his friendships, which was still further widened by the charm of his social intercourse, and by his very decided musical taste and ability. He was a welcome guest in all the numerous houses where he visited. As a minister of the gospel, he was greatly beloved and respected. To the promotion of education he gave his most earnest efforts. In the establishment of the Lancastrian Schools in this town (the earliest effort made here for the promotion of education among the children of the poor), he and the Rev. B. Rayson, then minister of the Independent chapel, were the most active labourers, aided chiefly by the generous contributions of their respective congregations and those of the members of the Society of Friends.

He was among the promoters of the original Mechanics' Institution of 1820, and afterwards of the present more matured organization, as well as of the Literary and Philosophical Society which intervened.

Mr. Johnstone's character was one of marked kindness, gentleness and urbanity. Without high principle it might have been somewhat too pliant for reliance. A natural easiness of temper probably favoured his longevity, and was certainly the blessing of his latter days, when he lived the honoured and loved inmate of one or other of his sons and daughters, everywhere contributing to the cheerful happiness of those around him. He was generous in a high degree; and was happy in being able, in the latter years of his life, to indulge, more freely than when family claims pressed heavily, in the luxury of giving. He will be regretted alike by equal associates and by poor beneficiaries; and to have been permitted to have him so long among us will not diminish the regret of losing him. The infirmities of age had only just begun materially to impair in him the zest of life. One fortnight before his death he was listening to Jenny Lind—his last appearance in public how characteristic! "The ruling passion strong!" Would that every ruling passion were as pure as that with which he loved music! His hearing was but little impaired, his *musical ear* not at all; his sight enfeebled, but not seriously—as if just to satisfy those who were devoted to his comfort, that when, by reason of constitutional strength, our age is more than fourscore years, however little labour and sorrow be, in such rare instances as his, experienced, it must "soon be cut off and fly away."

---

April 20, at Southampton, aged 57, Mr. JOHN HAYS, a constant attendant at the Unitarian chapel. He was for thirty-six years connected with the establishment of the Messrs. Lankester, of that town, by whom he was much and deservedly respected, and by a large circle of friends.

---

April 22, at his residence, Brént Lodge, Bridgwater, Captain GEORGE BROWNE, R.N., aged 74 years.

Captain Browne was born at Bridgwater on the 15th January, 1784. His first entrance in the King's service dates from the 1st Sept. 1797, when Admiral Sir Charles Pole procured him an entrance to the *Royal George*, Capt. Wm. Domett, then bearing the flag of Lord Bridport, who commanded the Channel Fleet. While serving upon this ship he witnessed



the engagement between the English ship *Mars*, 74 guns, and the French ship *l'Hercule*, 80 guns, when the latter was obliged to strike her flag. He was subsequently present at the attack made in June, 1799, by a detached squadron under Sir Charles Pole, on the combined French and Spanish squadrons in the Aix Roads.

He was shortly afterwards removed into the *Boadicea* frigate, under the command of Sir Richard G. Keats. This vessel was employed, as his former ship had been, in the blockade of the Brest French Fleet, cruising occasionally in the Channel and the Bay of Biscay, and assisting the French Royalists by landing arms and ammunition on various points of the bay of Quiberon.

In the year 1800, Sir Charles Pole was appointed to the command of the Newfoundland station, and hoisted his flag on board the *Agincourt*, Mr. Browne following his chief from the *Boadicea*. He remained on this station until Sir Charles was sent to succeed Lord Nelson in command of the Baltic Fleet, in 1801, when he accompanied him again to his new flag-ship, the *St. George*. While in the Baltic, Mr. Browne was honoured by being selected to assist in the responsible duty of surveying and buoying the Channel, prior to the line of battle ships passing through the Sound, and was highly commended by his captain, Sir Thomas Hardy, for the zeal, perseverance and ability which he had displayed in his share of that duty. Sir Charles Pole was appointed soon after to the command of the blockading squadron off Cadiz, and in this change was again accompanied by Mr. Browne, who, however, remained on board the *St. George* after Sir Charles resigned his command and returned to England. The *St. George* was then ordered to the West Indies, but remained there only a few months, and was put out of commission in July, 1802.

The great reduction which was at this time made in the service, threw many persons who would have gladly been employed in their country's service, into a state of inactivity, and amongst others Mr. Browne was consigned to a landsman's life for six months, till his old friend and captain, Sir Thomas Hardy, having a vacancy on board the *Amphion*, received him in his ship in Feb. 1803. On war being declared, Lord Nelson was appointed to the Mediterranean Fleet, and hoisted his flag in the *Amphion*. When, in July of the same year, Lord Nelson removed to the *Victory*, Mr. Browne accompanied him. His conduct

on board the *Victory* was of so marked a character, his devotion to his professional duties so enthusiastic, that he attracted the attention, and gained the confidence and esteem of Lord Nelson. There is a passage in a letter of Lord Nelson to Sir Charles Pole, which, in giving due praise to the late Captain Browne, is so characteristic of the writer, that we cannot forego the pleasure of quoting it: "I assure you that I most sincerely wish to promote Browne, who is an ornament to our service; but, alas! nobody will be so good as to die, nor will the French kill us. What can I do? But I live in hopes," &c.

When Lord Nelson hoped to do a kind action, it was not often that he allowed himself to be disappointed, and according to his custom, which he adopted when he wished to pay an especial compliment to an officer, he presented Mr. Browne with his Lieutenant's commission on the quarter-deck of the *Victory*, on the 1st August, 1804, being the anniversary of the battle of the Nile. Soon after this event, Lieut. Browne was appointed to the command of a Spanish prize, the schooner *Buona Ventura*, and was ordered to cruise off Barcelona: with the small force then at his command, he captured a Spanish vessel, of considerable size, with a numerous crew and a valuable cargo in specie and merchandize. He then returned to the *Victory*, and Lord Nelson lost no opportunity of placing him in such positions which enabled him to prove his professional skill, and gave evidence of the complete confidence which the greatest of England's naval heroes placed in him. The history of the manner in which Lord Nelson attempted to entice the French fleet from the port of Toulon, and his memorable, though unsuccessful, pursuit of it to the West Indies and back again to Europe, is too well known to need repetition; suffice it to say, that Lieutenant Browne distinguished himself by an attention to his professional duties which has never been excelled; for two years and a half scarcely ever setting his foot on shore, except when on duty; his leisure hours were always spent in studies connected with his profession, and instructing the youngsters under his care.

It may be interesting and fitting at this point to notice the remarkably temperate habits which distinguished Capt. Browne during his whole life. He was a water drinker all his days, and to this fact he and others have, in the writer's hearing, frequently ascribed the success which he attained in his profession, and the esteem in which he was held by his superiors.



They knew, and in cases of emergency it was a most important thing to know, that Mr. Browne would always have a cool head and a steady hand, and they valued him accordingly.

The *Victory* returned to England in August, 1805, to refit, but sailed again in September, on information being received that the combined fleets of France and Spain had reached Cadiz. On the 21st October, 1805, the battle of Trafalgar was fought. During the action, the post of Lieut. Browne was on the upper deck, where the loss in killed and wounded was most severe: he displayed his usual coolness and courage during the engagement, and when, shortly afterwards, it was expected that the combat would be renewed, he earned a well-merited compliment from Captain Hardy by the prompt manner in which he prepared his quarters for action, notwithstanding the loss that had been sustained.

On the return of the *Victory* to England, Nelson was honoured by a national funeral, and Captain Browne took his place as one of the officers of the *Victory* who bore the banner rolls of the departed Hero, and stood by the coffin as it was being lowered into its last resting-place. In Lord Nelson Mr. Browne lost a warm friend, who, if he had lived, would no doubt have seen his services adequately rewarded. As it was, the *Victory* was put out of commission, but Lieut. Browne was transferred to the *Ocean*, which bore the flag of Admiral Lord Collingwood, 27th December, 1805. On his joining the ship, the admiral recognizing him as an officer of merit, appointed him his flag-lieutenant, and took him with him on board the *Ville de Paris*, in which ship Mr. Browne continued whilst it cruized in the Mediterranean. While the fleet was off Minorca, on the 7th March, 1810, Lord Collingwood breathed his last, having only two days before written to the Admiralty, recommending Lieut. Browne for promotion, which was thus secured. As the admiral's flag-lieutenant, he was ordered home in charge of the body in the *Nereus* frigate. He attended his funeral, and having received his commission as commander, was promoted into the brig *L'Esperoir*, but only joined nominally, never serving in her. The pressing claims of senior officers rendered all his earnest and frequent applications for active employment useless. His old friends, the admirals under whom he had served, being dead, and having no political influence, he was unable to obtain employment, and after remaining a commander on half-pay more than

thirty years, he accepted the rank of Post Captain on the retired list, the 28th September, 1840.

On his return to Bridgwater, in 1810, Captain Browne took a small farm at Knowle Hill; but the peace precluding all prospect of further advancement in the Navy, and not finding farming a congenial occupation, he entered the Inner Temple on the 28th November, 1818, and was called in Hilary Term, 1824. He finally took up his residence at Exeter, and practised as a chamber counsel, employing his spare time in preparing students for the law. He was also appointed Revising Barrister on several occasions.

In the year 1836, Captain Browne gave up his practice and retired to his native town. He was placed upon the Commission of the Peace for the county of Somerset, and subsequently, on the passing of the Municipal Reform Act, he was made a Magistrate for the borough also. Unable to lead a life of inactivity, he took the office of Manager of the West-of-England Bank, on the establishment of the branch in this town, which office he filled till the month of July, 1855, when his declining strength compelled him at last to retire from the scene of active exertion.

Captain Browne from his youth was a Unitarian Christian; but he held these views not merely from early association, but also from deep conviction and as the result of conscientious inquiry. He was always willing to listen to the opinions of others, but he never scrupled to express his own views on matters pertaining to religion when the doctrines which he entertained were attacked. His religious principles were, however, in no way biassed by prejudices of sect; he was willing to recognize the good in every form of faith. He shrunk from anything that might appear at all like display in religious feeling, and perhaps the real depth of his devotional nature was not known to any one on earth. At the same time he evidently deeply valued the public services of religion, and while his health permitted, his tall and manly figure was seen in his accustomed seat regularly twice every Sunday. The writer of this brief sketch has had occasion to know how thoughtful and earnest a hearer he was, and how kind and candid a friend he could in consequence approve himself.

The practical effects of religious feeling shewed themselves in his life. He was calm in the midst of trial and affliction. Kind and courteous to all men, he shewed himself more kind the more his aid was needed. His thoughtfulness to save

others pain or trouble was remarkable, and extended to all persons with whom he came into connection. Most especially was he interested in educational movements; he was a liberal subscriber to the schools in his own town, and, what was more valuable, a regular and intelligent visitor; giving advice and counsel, and delighted in witnessing signs of improvement and of progress. As a magistrate, his attention had naturally been called to the prevalence of juvenile delinquency, and his charity and benevolence led him to take a deep interest in the various efforts made of late years to establish efficient Reformatory Schools. Works bearing on such subjects he read with deep and growing interest, and his remarks upon what he read were as valuable as they were interesting. In all things he was of a truly hopeful Christian spirit. In his own private affairs he was gifted with unusual powers of perseverance and concentration, and his success in his varied career was proportionately remarkable. His life was prolonged beyond the allotted span of threescore years and ten, and ended only when, to all appearance, his powers of enjoying life were drawing to their close. Like the rich and ripened grain, he was gathered in unto his rest, and peacefully and quietly he fell asleep. There are many who mourn the blank which his absence has made; but there are none who could have wished the end different to what it was. As death drew near, his loving heart seemed only to grow more genial and more kind, as if preparing for that realm of love to which his spirit was about to depart.

Respected, honoured and loved in life, he was followed to the tomb by many of his fellow-townsmen unconnected with the religious denomination to which he belonged; and amongst all who knew him, his name will be connected with ennobling memories and sweet thoughts that can never die.

S. A. S.

April 24, aged 7 years, WILLIAM HENRY, only son of Joshua BUXTON, Esq., Headingley Hill, Leeds.

April 25, at her residence at Clifton, in the 75th year of her age, MARIA, widow of the late Gideon ACLAND, Esq., of Camberwell.

In recording the decease of this excellent lady, we feel precluded from more than a very brief summary of the estimable qualities which would well entitle her memory to an extended as well as grateful notice in these pages. In undertaking

this duty, we must be governed by the recollection that it was a marked attribute of Mrs. Acland's mind to shrink from anything in the form of publicity. Surrounded in her earlier life with domestic anxieties, and during its most vigorous period devoted to the care of a numerous family, she seemed to prize the opportunity which the relaxation of those cares presented, for indulging in the quiet occupations of a refined taste and an untiring love of books, from which the solicitations of society rarely diverted her, and which ministered to her cheerfulness and tranquillity throughout the course of a long, but not unuseful life. We have been induced to take notice of these habits of Mrs. Acland's mind, from the estimate they enable us to form of that deeper interest still which could overrule them, in her ever-wakeful desire to promote the welfare of society and the improvement and happiness of her fellow-creatures.

With all the ardour of her affectionate nature, and all the intelligence of her well-stored mind, her sympathies were enlisted in the cause of the young. If enthusiasm in anything could be ascribed to so placid and even a spirit, it might to her love of little children; and the only subject, we believe, that ever tempted her into print was an exposition, very brief, but full of practical wisdom, on the duties of the nursery, and the importance of care, from their very earliest moments, in the sanitary and moral influences which should be brought to bear upon little infants. It was but natural that this early-cherished feeling should lead her to hail the efforts first made by Robert Owen at New Lanark, and subsequently by Lord Brougham in London, to establish Infant Schools. These experiments deeply interested her; and among the foremost to witness and to profit by the success of the latter, was the subject of our present notice.

It was about this period that Mrs. Acland, then become a widow, removed with her youthful family to Clifton. Till that time she had been a steady member of the congregation of Mr. Belsham in London, towards whom she entertained the warmest regard, and of whose piety, worth and talents, she ever preserved a profound impression. Circumstances, however, having rendered it desirable that she should change her residence, we believe it was mainly at the suggestion of Mr. Belsham that her choice was directed to Clifton, where she would be within reach of the religious ministrations of Rev. Dr. Carpenter, an advantage she highly prized and for many years unremittently enjoyed.



On her removal to the neighbourhood of Bristol, an intimacy was early formed with one but recently withdrawn from this lower scene of our human interests and friendships, and to whose distinguished character we were called to offer the homage of our respectful notice in our February No. of this year. That individual was the late Mrs. Susanna Morgan, of Staffordshire, formerly a resident of Clifton; and to this lady Mrs. Acland having communicated her thoughts on the subject of infant schools,—it was immediately determined, in conjunction with the late Mrs. Richard Smith and other influential and benevolent persons, to establish one in Bristol, the first that was attempted in England out of London. It will be interesting to some readers to be reminded that this school was opened in Castle Green, and subsequently was removed to Meadow Street; but that there the connection of Mrs. Acland and Mrs. Morgan with it terminated, those ladies having failed to induce the managing committee to adhere to *their original purpose of undogmatic religious teaching*. This disappointment was the less to be regretted, as it led to the immediate establishment of a similar school on the original liberal basis, in connection with the Lewin's Mead society, which has ever since been conducted with eminent success,—being among the best reported of by Her Majesty's Inspectors of schools.

Carrying on her ideas of infant instruction, if such it might be called, Mrs. Acland proposed to establish under the auspices of the same society an Intermediate School, where the boys and girls should be received at the age of six years, when she wished they should invariably leave the infant school, always designed by her rather as a happy and healthy *nursery* than a school; and on leaving which they would pass on to the maturer stage, where there would be a *mixture of play and lessons*, until nine; at which age they would be received into the more sedentary schools long supported by the congregation. Such was the scheme of Mrs. Acland; and, modified more or less as it has necessarily been by the practical difficulties and altered methods which experience would develop and suggest,—to her, and to the energetic associates who joined and supported her, are justly to be attributed the educational spirit then awakened, and, through it, the high position attained by those schools in whose origination and superintendence they took so zealous and enlightened an interest.

It was only in keeping with her unceasing concern for the protection of the young, that the condition of that hapless class from which “climbing-boys” were furnished excited in her the warmest interest, and prompted her to concert with others the most efficient means for putting a stop to a system fraught with untold barbarities, and so long unaccountably tolerated in a civilized and Christian community.

It may, in truth, be said that, though these peculiar opportunities of exercising her humane dispositions and her generous sympathies more immediately occupied her, there was nothing human which had not its interest for her mind. Under the charm of a gentleness and suavity of manner which captivated all who approached her, those who had the privilege of her more intimate conversation could not but derive instruction from the largeness of her views, the solidity of her judgment, and the vivacity and strength of her most cherished convictions. Few thought more strongly; few, if any, ever spoke more gently. In her declining days, favoured as she was by a most gradual loosening of the springs of life, her prevailing tastes remained,—her love of books—her love of flowers—her love of nature, especially in the first outbursts of spring—and, not least, her love of little children, whose occasional visits were among her latest and most vivid pleasures. A life so spent in its active period, could not be otherwise than peaceful and hopeful at its close. We never saw the Christian hope more firmly seated, or were privileged to hear it uttered with a conviction more fervid and a consolation more inspiring. It was “such a sober certainty of coming bliss,” with such humility withal, as we could have hardly thought a nature so little partaking of what is commonly called enthusiasm could reach to. It was, indeed, good to be there. The earthly tabernacle was dissolving, but the spirit was never more conscious. Its conversation had long been in heaven, yet was yearning to pass, in fulness of presence, to its promised rest, its everlasting joy. Some of the latest words around which memory lingered were these:

“There is a glorious world on high,  
Resplendent with eternal day;  
Faith views the blissful prospect nigh,  
While God's own word reveals the way.”

So lived and died this Christian woman, this tender mother, this kind friend. May our last end be like hers!